

THE MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

*A QUARTERLY JOURNAL EDITED FOR THE
MODERN HUMANITIES RESEARCH ASSOCIATION*

BY

CHARLES J. SISSON

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE

AND

ALEXANDER GILLIES

VOLUME XXXIX



CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

1944

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

CONTENTS

ARTICLES	PAGE
AVANESOV, REUBEN, Problems of Dialectology in the Soviet Union	167
BENNETT, H. S., Science and Information in English Writings of the Fifteenth Century	1
BISSON, L. A., Proust and Ruskin: Reconsidered in the Light of 'Lettres à une amie'	28
CHICOTEAU, MARCEL, Le rôle de la nature dans 'L'Iphigénie' de Racine	347
DODDS, M. HOPE, Heathcliff's Country	116
DODDS, W. M. T., Robert South and William Sherlock: some Unpublished Letters	215
DOWNES, BRIAN W., Anglo-Danish Literary Relations 1867-1900	262
GARDNER, HELEN L., John Donne: a Note on Elegie V, 'His Picture'	333
GILLIES, A., Herder's Preparation of Romantic Theory	252
GRIERSON, H. J. C., Milton and Liberty	97
HATTO, A. T., The Name of God in Gothic	247
HENNIG, JOHN, Goethe's Friendship with Anthony O'Hara	146
HENNIG, JOHN, Primer-Versions of Liturgical Prayers	325
HIGGINS, MICHAEL, The Convention of the Stoic Hero as handled by Marston . .	338
JONES, P. MANSELL, Poe, Baudelaire and Mallarmé: a Problem of Literary Judgement	236
KNIGHT, R. C., Hippolyte and Hippolytos	225
KRAPPE, ALEXANDER H., The Fisher King	18, 280
MAGOUN, FRANCIS P., JR., The Iceland Voyage in the 'Nibelungenlied'	38
MARTIN, F. R., Pascal and Miguel de Unamuno	138
ORR, JOHN, Some Ambivalent Words and an Etymology	130
POZELYEVSKY, A., Linguistics in Soviet Turkmenia	392
ROBERTSON, JEAN, The Use made of Owen Felltham's 'Resolves': A Study in Plagiarism	108
ROCKETT, K., An Optimistic Streak in Voltaire's Thought	24
SCHWARZ, W., Translation into German in the Fifteenth Century	368
SHAFIN, BETTY, An Experiment in Memorial Reconstruction	9
STAHL, E. L., Symbolism in Hölderlin's Early Poetry (1784-1800)	43
STAHL, E. L., Symbolism in Hölderlin's Poetry 1800-1804	152
STARKIE, ENID, A little-known Precursor of Baudelaire. The 'Bouzingo' Philothée O'Neddy	357
STOLL, ELMER EDGAR, Plot and Character: on the Stagirite's behalf	209
TURVILLE-PETRE, G., Gísli Súrsson and his Poetry: Traditions and Influences .	374
VINOKUR, GRIGORY, Russian Linguistics in War Time	172, 290
WEISS, R., The Imperfect Rhymes E:I, O:U in Early Italian Poetry	134
MISCELLANEOUS NOTES	
BLOCHMANN, ELISABETH, Goethe autographs in the album of an Irishman	58
GORDON, D. J., Chapman's use of Cartari in the Fifth Sestiad of 'Hero and Leander'	280
KÖKERITZ, HELGE, Thy Pole-Clipt Vineyard, 'The Tempest', iv, 1, 68	178
KRISHNAMURTI, S., A Note on 'The Pardoner's Tale', lines 237-239	398
KUSKYAN, JOSEPH, The Study of Armenian in Soviet Armenia	287
MAAS, P., Note on 'M.L.R.' 1943, p. 128	179

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES (<i>cont.</i>)	PAGE
MALONE, KEMP, The With-Myrgings of 'Widsith'	55
MARILLA, E. L., Henry and Thomas Vaughan	180
MAXWELL, SUE, A Misprint in Marmion's 'Holland's Leaguer'	179
MIKHALCHI, DMITRI, Ancient Literature in Russian Translations	63
SCOTT, FLORENCE R., 'News from Plimouth' and Sir Positive At-all	183
SISSON, C. J., Londra Türk Halkevi	290
URWIN, KENNETH, Northern English 'Mardy'	280
URWIN, KENNETH, The 'Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles' and 'Pathelin'	185
URWIN, KENNETH and NANCY JONES, The concessive use of 'Quant' in Old French	56
WALTER, J. H., The Dumb Show and the 'Mouse Trap'	286
REVIEWS	
Adams, J. C., The Globe Playhouse (H. GRANVILLE-BARKER)	296
Atkins, J. W. H., English Literary Criticism: The Medieval Phase (J. F. LOCKWOOD)	399
Bakeless, J., The Tragical History of Christopher Marlowe (F. S. BOAS)	75
Baldwin, T. W., William Shakspeare's Petty School (G. D. WILLCOCK)	76
Bisson, L. A., Des Vers de France; A Short History of French Literature (L. W. TANCOCK and W. J. ENTWISTLE)	302
Boccaccio, De Claris Mulieribus, trans. by Lord Morley, ed. by H. G. Wright (E. J. SWEETING)	188
Bonjour, A., Coleridge's 'Hymn before Sunrise' (J. M. S. TOMPKINS)	417
Brady, C., The Legends of Ermanaric (R. GIRVAN)	403
Brown, A. C. L., The Origin of the Grail Legend (W. J. GRUFFYDD)	202
Cailliet, E., La Tradition Littéraire des Idéologues (F. T. H. FLETCHER)	307
Cailliet, E., The Clue to Pascal (H. F. STEWART)	419
Carnap, R., Introduction to Semantics (S. POTTER)	186
Chambers, E. K., A Sheaf of Studies (G. TILLOTSON)	201
Craigie, W. A., Problems of Spelling Reform (S. POTTER)	402
Das, S. K., Cynewulf and the Cynewulf Canon (C. L. WRENN)	67
Ellis, H. R., The Road to Hel (R. GIRVAN)	313
Fairchild, H. N., Religious Trends in English Poetry, II, 1740-1780 (M. S. SERJEANTSON)	78
Gilman, M., Baudelaire the Critic (E. STARKIE)	81
Gordon, G., Shakespearian Comedy and other Studies (C. J. SISSON)	405
Hart, A., Stolne and Surreptitious Copies (M. DORAN)	190
Hatcher, A. G., Reflexive Verbs: Latin, Old French, Modern French (T. B. W. REID)	300
Hispanic American Essays, ed. by A. C. Wilgus (E. SARMIENTO)	83
Hofrichter, R., Three Poets and Reality (E. M. BUTLER)	86
Hughes, M. J., Women Healers in Medieval Life and Literature (H. S. BENNETT)	295
Icelandic Poems and Stories, ed. by R. Beck (C. L. WRENN)	88
Izard, T. C., George Whetstone (JEAN ROBERTSON)	73
Kristeller, P. O., The Philosophy of Marsilio Ficino (R. WEISS)	420
Lancaster, H. C., Adventures of a Literary Historian (L. W. TANCOCK)	309
Lancaster, H. C., A History of French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century, v, Recapitulation (L. A. BISSON)	79
Martz, L. L., The Later Career of Tobias Smollett (J. C. BRYCE)	198
Medieval and Renaissance Studies, I, 2, ed. by R. Hunt and R. Klibansky (R. WEISS)	186

REVIEWS (<i>cont.</i>)	PAGE
Merry Devil of Edmonton, The, ed. by W. A. Abrams (G. I. DUTHIE)	193
Meyer, G. W., Wordsworth's Formative Years (E. C. BATHO)	199
Milton, J., Complete Poetical Works reproduced in photographic facsimile, ed. by H. F. Fletcher, 1 (W. W. GREG)	409
Mossner, E. C., The Forgotten Hume (J. C. BRYCE)	197
Newman Treasury, A., ed. by C. F. Harrold (C. J. SISSON)	418
Nolte, F. O., Art and Reality (E. M. WILKINSON)	401
Oxforders Buch Deutscher Prosa von Luther bis Rilke, Das, ed. by H. G. Fiedler (A. GILLIES)	87
Pollock, T. C., The Nature of Literature (J. C. BRYCE)	64
Pope, A., The Dunciad, ed. by J. Sutherland (E. C. BATHO)	196
Proctor, S. K., Thomas De Quincey's Theory of Literature (B. E. C. DAVIS)	200
Rabin, C., Everyday Hebrew (B. J. ROBERTS)	89
Racine, J., Mithridate, ed. by G. Rudler (H. E. BERTHON)	304
Reaney, P. H., The Place-Names of Cambridgeshire and the Isle of Ely (S. POTTER)	65
Richey, M. F., Essays on the Mediæval German Love Lyric (A. CLOSS)	83
Ringler, W., Stephen Gosson (J. ROBERTSON)	189
Robacker, E. F., Pennsylvania German Literature (W. F. MAINLAND)	421
Roberts, K. S., Orthography, Phonology and Word Study of the 'Leal Conselheiro' (J. B. SABINO COSTA)	312
Russo, H. J., Morphology and Syntax of the 'Leal Conselheiro' (J. B. SABINO COSTA)	312
Saintonge, P. and R. W. Christ, Fifty Years of Molière Studies (W. G. MOORE)	80
Sauvigny, B. de, Vashington, ed. by G. Chinard (L. W. TANCOCK)	309
Shaw, E. P., Jacques Cazotte (W. LL. BULLOCK)	306
Slavonic Studies, ed. by A. Kaun and E. J. Simmons (W. J. ROSE and GLEB STRUVE)	203
Solomon and Saturn, The Poetical Dialogues of, ed. by R. J. Menner (C. L. WRENN)	68
Spencer, T., Shakespeare and the Nature of Man (P. ALEXANDER)	406
Stenton, F. M., Anglo-Saxon England (D. WHITELOCK)	293
Stronski, S., La Poésie et la Réalité aux Temps des Troubadours (H. J. CHAYTOR)	79
Tillyard, E. M. W., The Elizabethan World Picture (H. J. C. GRIERSON)	69
Vices and Virtues, The Book of, ed. by W. N. Francis (J. P. OAKDEN)	404
Wagman, F. H., Magic and Natural Science in German Baroque Literature (L. FORSTER)	84
White, W., John Donne since 1900 (G. TILLOTSON)	195
Whitfield, J. H., Petrarch and the Renaissance (R. WEISS)	310
Wilson, J. D., The Fortunes of Falstaff (P. ALEXANDER)	408
Wright, R., Dictionnaire des Instruments de Musique (P. A. SCHOLES)	299
Yule, G. U., The Statistical Study of Literary Vocabulary (W. W. GREG)	291

SHORT NOTICES

Bhattacharje, M. M., 'Courtesy' in Shakespeare (B. E. C. DAVIS)	206
Blunden, E., Romantic Poetry and the Fine Arts (E. C. BATHO)	91
Boas, F. S., Aspects of Classical Legend and History in Shakespeare (C. J. SISSON)	205
Carossa, H., Eine Kindheit, ed. by J. Bithell (A. GILLIES)	92
Casalduero, J., Vida y obra de Galdós (E. A. PEERS)	425

SHORT NOTICES (<i>cont.</i>)	PAGE
Corneille, P., <i>Le Cid</i> , ed. by A. Macdonald (W. G. MOORE)	91
Edward the Confessor, <i>The Middle English Verse Life of</i> , ed. by G. E. Moore (J. P. OAKDEN)	423
Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association, xxviii, ed. by R. W. Chapman (W. HUSBANDS)	315
Frank, H. G., <i>Holland Afloat</i> (S. H. F. JOHNSTON)	317
Gaudin, L. S., <i>Les Lettres Anglaises dans L'Encyclopédie</i> (GWYN JONES)	90
Gudmund the Good, Bishop of Holar, <i>The Life of</i> , trans. by G. Turville-Petre and E. S. Olszewska (E. C. BATHO)	317
Hatfield, H. C., <i>Winckelmann and his German Critics, 1755-81</i> (A. GILLIES)	426
Hebbel, F., <i>Herodes und Mariamne</i> , ed. by E. Purdie (R. PEACOCK)	426
Hocking, G. D., <i>A study of the 'Tragoediae Sacrae' of Father Caussin</i> (H. W. LAWTON)	315
Knight, G. W., <i>The Olive and the Sword</i> (W. M. T. DODDS)	423
Latin American Studies, <i>Handbook of, 1941</i> , ed. by M. Burgin (E. SARMIENTO)	424
Lindner, G. D., <i>Marcel Proust, Reviews and Estimates in English</i> (L. A. BISSON)	92
Mardhekar, B. S., <i>Two Lectures on an Aesthetic of Literature</i> (E. J. SWEETING)	422
Moore, J. R., <i>Defoe's Sources for 'Robert Drury's Journal'</i> (GWYN JONES)	90
Onions, C. T., <i>The Fate of French -é in English; The Plural of Nouns ending in -th</i> (S. POTTER)	205
Pei, M. A., <i>Languages for War and Peace</i> (W. J. ENTWISTLE)	424
Rilke, R. M., <i>Letters to a Young Poet</i> , trans. by K. W. Maurer (E. M. BUTLER)	206
Ružić, R. H., <i>The Aspects of the Verb in Serbo-Croatian</i> (S. POTTER)	207
Shumaker, E. J., <i>Concise Bibliography of the Complete Works of Richard H. Horne</i> (E. C. BATHO)	206
Voltaire, <i>Lettres Philosophiques</i> , ed. by F. A. Taylor (H. TEMPLE PATTERSON)	316
Wordsworth's <i>Pocket Notebook</i> , ed. by G. H. Healey (E. C. BATHO)	91
<i>Work in Progress 1942</i> , ed. by J. M. Osborn and P. Withner (C. J. SISSON)	314
Young, G. M., <i>Basic</i> (S. POTTER)	314
NEW PUBLICATIONS	93, 208, 318, 427
ACCOUNTS OF THE MODERN HUMANITIES RESEARCH ASSOCIATION	322
EDITORIAL NOTES	290, 324

SCIENCE AND INFORMATION IN ENGLISH WRITINGS
OF THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY

The publication of *English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century* (1913) by C. L. Kingsford showed for the first time the mass of historical writings in the vernacular (to say nothing of those in Latin) which the fifteenth century saw in circulation. He was at pains to argue that such a state of affairs postulated a widespread ability to read, and this point is further emphasized in his *Prejudice and Promise in XVth Century England* (1925).¹ What he says there has been supported by the researches of Professor J. W. Adamson who, in a paper read to the Bibliographical Society in 1929; entitled 'The Extent of Literacy in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries', collected a great deal of evidence on this point. More recently it has been shown that a considerable 'reading public' was created during the fifteenth century, that a demand for vernacular literature was spreading rapidly, and that a diversity of literary wares was forthcoming to meet this new demand.² The situation as it developed in the fifteenth century may be further clarified by examining the material writers were providing in certain fields, and for this purpose I have taken the work of the century with which Professor J. E. Wells, in his *Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050-1400*, deals in a chapter headed 'Science, Information, Documents'. Wells thus sums up the output in these fields before 1400: 'Scientific and documentary composition of all sorts in the period (i.e. 1050-1400) was for the most part not in English. Yet there survive in the vernacular a few technical treatises, medical recipes, pieces on the virtues of plants, statements of the characteristics of countries or of districts, glosses, specifications of measures, writings on natural philosophy, charms, interpretations of dreams and natural phenomena, documents, etc.'³ In the account which follows, Wells's classification has been retained and the materials discussed in his *Manual* and the Seven Supplements taken as a convenient and trustworthy indication of what was available up to 1400.

1. TREATISES ON HUNTING

Hunting was one of the commonest of medieval aristocratic recreations, so that it is rather surprising to find only one work on that subject in English, prior to 1400. This is Twici's *Treatise on Hunting*, written not later than 1328 in French and translated into English towards the end of the century, and a copy of this has survived in the Cottonian collection, Vespasian B XII, a manuscript of about 1420.

By this time, however, the demand for an authoritative work on the subject in the vernacular had been met by the second Duke of York's translation of Gaston de Foix's *Livre de Chasse* under the title of *The Master of Game*. This translation was probably made between 1406 and 1413, and was so popular that nineteen manuscripts of it, all dating from the fifteenth century, are known and probably more still survive.⁴ Besides this outstanding work other manuscripts, such as Cambridge Ll. 1. 18 or Lambeth 491, suggest that smaller vernacular treatises were provided for those whose purses would not allow them to buy the large

¹ See pp. 34-5.

² *R.E.S.* XIX, 113-19. *Caxton and his Public*, by H. S. Bennett.

³ Op. cit. p. 427.

⁴ For the text, illustrations and much information about this work see the edition of W. A. and F. Baillie-Grohman, 1904.

manuscript. Ll. 1. 18, 'Here begynneth the tretyse off huntyng', sets out the principles of the chase, the varieties of beasts which may be hunted, the meaning of the various sounds of the horn, etc.¹ Lambeth 491, f. 287 begins:

My dere sone wher so 3e fare by frith or by felle
Taketh gode heed how Trystram wold telle
How many manere bestis of venery ther were
Lystenith 3e to 30^r dame and y schal 3ow lere
ffour manere bestis of venery ther are
pe fyrst of hem is p^e hert p^e second is p^e hare &c.²

while other manuscripts, such as Egerton 1995, f. 63 and Harleian 2340, f. 50, explain to the reader the four beasts of venery and allied topics. *The Craft of Venery*, which survives in a manuscript of about 1450, is in fact only a late version of Twici's treatise to which some additions have been made, but which remained sufficiently worth while to be copied early in the sixteenth century as one of the items in a 'Great Book', now Lansdowne 285.³

Another highly popular sport was hawking, but Wells makes no mention of this. Early treatises on this subject in the vernacular are rare, despite the fact that every gentleman from the King downwards was interested in the sport, and the care and training of hawks was an inseparable part of the curriculum followed by page and squire. Probably manuals were more frequent than the existing number would suggest, for it is most likely that their constant use made it inevitable that they fell to pieces sooner or later, literally thumbed out of existence. The earliest example remaining is found in a manuscript of about 1340 (Harleian 2340).⁴ This is a small volume of some 53 folios, the first 22 of which are concerned with hawking, after which follow some 23 pages on the diseases of hawks, and the remainder with more recipes and lists of beasts of venery, etc. Another work, written in a manuscript towards the end of the century (Sloane 2721), is a practical treatise which deals almost entirely with the training and management of hawks. These two works were followed in the fifteenth century by others, of which three examples survive in Egerton 1995, Sloane 3488 and Trinity, Cambridge, O. 9. 38.⁵ Finally, it may be noted that hunting and hawking were still of sufficient importance in 1486 to warrant the publication of a printed volume, *The Book of St Albans*, reputed to be the work of Dame Juliana Barnes. Much of this work is not original, however, and dates back to manuscripts such as Harleian 2340, or even to the work of Twici himself.⁶

2. MEDICAL AND PLANT TREATISES

In this section of his *Manual* Wells deals with medical recipes and treatises on surgery, the former in nine entries and the latter in three, while eight more follow which are concerned with writings on herbs and herbal medicines.⁷ To take

¹ Cambridge University Library, Ll. 1. 18, f. 50.

² See *A Descriptive Catalogue of the MSS. in the Library of Lambeth Palace*, by M. R. James and C. Jenkins, 1930, p. 682.

³ For a discussion of this manuscript and its contents see the article by Curt. F. Bühler in *Modern Language Notes*, LVI, 345.

⁴ See also Rawlinson C. 506 (Bodleian MSS.), f. 310 for an early fifteenth-century copy of this tract.

⁵ Egerton 1995, f. 55; Sloane 3488, f. 1, and Trin. Coll. Camb. O. 9. 38, f. 21. Another fragment is to be found in Ashmole 1432, f. 12.

⁶ The publication was successful enough to call

for an enlarged edition by W. de Worde in 1496, while it was several times reprinted in the sixteenth century. The edition of 1496 contained as an appendix, 'A treatise of fishing with an angle'. A late fifteenth-century manuscript is in the Library of David Wagstaff of Tuxedo Park, New York.

⁷ It must be noted, however, that each of these entries may concern a number of manuscripts. As an extreme case Item 7, 'Recipes in the British Museum', is a block reference to 'about fifty' collections of medical recipes. In general, however, each entry is concerned with a very limited number of manuscripts.

the mediæcal treatises first. The growth of vernacular literature is perhaps nowhere more notable than in the multiplication of medical manuscripts in the fifteenth century. As might be expected, odd recipes and remedies are scattered through manuscripts of the period, sometimes on fly-leaves or in odd half-pages, and sometimes covering even one or two leaves. More important, however, is the number of treatises, great and small, which were entirely devoted to medical remedies and prescriptions. In the Sloane collection alone there are some forty such manuscripts, and every other large collection shows similar if slighter evidence. It is clear that English homes and English readers (professional or lay) were making use of vernacular instruction on what hitherto had been very largely written in Latin only, and were doing so to a considerable extent.

Even more significant are the treatises which deal with special diseases, for these are more technical. Naturally enough, those dealing with plague are by far the most numerous, and of these, the treatise by Jean de Burdeux was of outstanding popularity. The *Tractatus de morbo epidemiæ* was written about 1365, was translated into English soon afterwards, and rapidly gained currency.¹ The treatise is found in English in a longer and in a shorter form, and there was even an abridgement which dealt with the pest in the shortest possible form.

Next to these 'handbooks' on plague, the most widely spread medical treatises were those which circulated under some such title as 'The Judgment of Urines'. These little manuals must have been in great demand, judging by the number which have survived. It is true that Latin treatises were still very widespread, but they no longer held the field almost to the exclusion of vernacular accounts, so that I have been able to trace nearly seventy tractates on this subject, most of them of the fifteenth century. In general they are anonymous, but the compilations of John of Arderne, the English physician, and Father Henry Daniel, the Dominican, are notable exceptions. They are written in direct simple English, obviously for the use of laymen in many cases, as is indeed made clear by the heading of a tract in the Cambridge University Library which reads: 'Tractatus... composuit breviter in lingua materna magis plane ad intelligentiam laicorum ad eos gubernandum prout placet Altissimo ad requisitionem Regis Ricardi secundi et Anne Regine.'²

While these two subjects seem to have attracted most attention, treatises dealing with special diseases or with special treatments also made an appearance. Thus we have works on stone,³ or gout;⁴ on the diseases of women,⁵ or of the different parts of the body,⁶ while the common mediæval practice of blood-letting is the subject of a large number of works.⁷

More ambitious works dealing with the whole field of medicine also began to appear. A great deal of investigation is still necessary before much can be said about the original sources from which such works were derived, but in the main they originated from the treatises known as 'the books of Galen, Hippocrates,

¹ See *John de Burdeus... and the Pestilence*, by D. Murray, 1891, and K. Sudhoff in *Archiv für Geschichte der Medizin*, v (1912), 58-80. I have enlarged on the number of MSS. identified by them, and have listed over 40 copies of the treatise in its several versions. For pestilence tracts see Sloane 2276, f. 191. For pestilence tracts by other authors, see Sloane 404, f. 243; 2276, f. 191.

² Camb. Univ. Lib. II. vi. 17, f. 2.

³ See Addit. MSS. Brit. Mus. 24,059, f. 23.

⁴ See Harleian 2274, f. 50; Ashmole 1481, f. 92.

⁵ See Camb. Univ. Lib. II. vi. 33, f. 1; Sloane 249, f. 180.

⁶ See Addit. MSS. 30,338, f. 11 b; Trin. Coll. Camb. O. 8. 35, f. 85.

⁷ See Trin. Coll. Camb. O. 1. 9, f. 10; Caius Coll. Camb. 84, f. 205; Egerton 1995, f. 79. I have listed over thirty manuscripts in verse and prose.

Socrates and Aesculapius'.¹ At the moment, however, it is important to record that works of this nature, setting out a 'practice of medicine', appeared in large numbers in the fifteenth century, and that there was sufficient demand for them in the vernacular to overcome professional conservatism and prejudice against making medical matters available to all who could read.²

Writers of surgical works also began to desert the Latin. Lanfranc, an Italian physician and surgeon of Milan, wrote his *Chirurgia Magna* while in exile in Paris in 1296, and this was translated into English later, and appears in a manuscript (Ashmole 1396) of c. 1380,³ while at least six copies of the treatise complete or abridged were made during the next century.⁴ Vernacular renderings of other text-books of surgery, such as that of the famous French surgeon Guy de Chauliac,⁵ or those of William of Saliceto⁶ and John of St Paul, may also be noted. Naturally, however, the works of the celebrated English surgeon, John of Arderne, were most in demand, especially his treatise on fistula. No translation of this appears to exist before 1400, but after that date it was certainly translated, and at least seven copies survive. Other of his works, such as his *De judiciis urinis*, or *Hoc est Speculum Phlebotomiae* or *Liber Medicinis*, were also translated, and manuscripts of each of these works have come down to us.⁷

Individual tracts dealing with special topics also occur. We have works on the treatment of wounds,⁸ on obstetrics,⁹ on hernia,¹⁰ on the eyes,¹¹ as well as others describing the qualities of a surgeon.¹² This far from complete survey of the manuscript evidence available makes it clear that vernacular copies of works on medicine and surgery of every description were circulating in some numbers during the fifteenth century.

Writings on plants, herbs and herbal remedies in English, although scarce in the centuries after the Conquest, began to appear in the fourteenth century.¹³ This output, however, was certainly trebled or quadrupled in the next century, and a considerable variety of texts remain. Many are herbal treatises, such as Lansdowne 680, f. 1, which sets forth 'the vertuys of Erbyz aftyr Galyon, Ypocras and Socrates', and catalogue minutely the beneficial effects to be obtained from a large number of herbs. These tracts are generally arranged with the names of the herbs in alphabetical order so as to facilitate rapid reference.¹⁴ Another very popular treatise was based on a translation of Aemilius Macer, *De virtutibus herbarum*,¹⁵ as in Sloane 5, f. 13, which is said to be a translation first made in 1373 by J. Lelamour, schoolmaster of Hertford, or as in Sloane 393, a work by another translator, T. Kytte (ff. 87-145). Then again special herbs such as rosemary or betony are treated individually, as in a manuscript of Trinity College, Cambridge,

¹ See the *Liber de Diversis Medicinis*, ed. M. S. Ogden (E.E.T.S.), 1938, p. xvii: 'The fifteenth-century collections...are to a considerable extent composed of ancient materials transmitted to them through a long line of similar compilations.'

² I have listed thirty such items mainly in fifteenth-century manuscripts.

³ See *The 'Science of Chirurgie'*, ed. R. von Fleischhacker (E.E.T.S.), 1894, which prints both Ashmole 1396 and Addit. MSS. Brit. Mus. 12,056.

⁴ See, e.g., Ashmole 1396, f. 1 for *Chirurgia Magna* and Addit. MSS. 10,440 for *Chirurgia Minor*.

⁵ See Sloane 1, f. 1; 965, f. 23; 3666, f. 2.

⁶ Sloane 6, f. 53; Addit. MSS. 10,440, f. 1.

⁷ An early fifteenth-century translation of all these works is to be found in the Library of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, No. 69.

⁸ Camb. Univ. Lib. Dd. v. 76; Trin. Coll. Camb. O. 9. 39, vol. II, f. 1.

⁹ Camb. Univ. Lib. Ee. 1. 13, f. 130; Addit. MSS. 12,195, f. 1.

¹⁰ Trin. Coll. Camb. O. 7. 23, f. 44.

¹¹ Sloane 77; Glasgow Univ. Lib. 503, f. 1.

¹² Sloane 6, f. 142; Emm. Coll. Camb. 69.

¹³ About 30 manuscripts earlier than 1400 on this subject are mentioned by Wells.

¹⁴ At least twelve manuscripts survive.

¹⁵ Sixteen texts of this have been identified in various translations.

which begins: 'This is ye lityl boke of ye vertuys of rosmaryn yt y^e scole of Salerne gadered and compiled at instance of ye. Cowntese of Henowde [Hainault]... I danyel han translatyd into vulgar ynglysch worde for worde as fonde in latyn.'¹

Another set of treatises deals with the making of oils,² or the preparation of medicinal waters from herbs,³ while others deal with the best seasons for gathering medicinal herbs.⁴

3. GLOSSES

The Norman occupation of England after the Conquest made it necessary to provide glosses from time to time for legal or professional or special purposes. Lawyers found a gloss of French and English terms a convenience, and one made c. 1130-50 is said to survive in up to fifty manuscripts. Plant glosses also were very popular. These gave the English or French equivalents of many plants described in the herbals as useful for medicinal purposes.⁵ The fifteenth century saw this demand increased. Legal glosses, it is true, did not increase, but this is a natural consequence of the edict which laid it down in 1356 that only English should be used in the Sheriffs' courts, and in 1362 extended this provision to the greater courts.

Plant glosses, however, multiplied exceedingly. We have numerous manuscripts which give the names of herbs in Latin and English, or occasionally they are in French and English,⁶ whereas the earlier manuscripts which make use of all three languages do not seem to be so much in demand. More general glosses, such as that of Walter de Bibbesworth, continued to be popular, but the outstanding achievement of the century in this direction was the production of a series of dictionaries. In his introduction to the *Promptorium Parvulorum*⁷ Albert Way discusses very fully the nature of this work, and lists six extant manuscripts, to which may be added a seventh (Addit. MSS. 37,789). Here for the first time was an attempt to provide an English-Latin dictionary for the common reader.

The complementary volume, giving a Latin-English order, was called *Medulla Grammaticae*, and the earliest example of it is supposed to have been compiled by the author of the *Promptorium*.⁸ As might be expected it was the more popular of the two works, so that eighteen manuscripts have survived.⁹ To these may be added some nine or ten other manuscripts of Latin-English equivalents.¹⁰ Further signs of the growing demand may be seen in the appearance of 'school books', in which the rules of Latin grammar are set out partly in Latin, partly in English,¹¹ or in which 'how many maners schalt thou bygynne to make Latyn' are discussed.¹²

4. GEOGRAPHY, TRAVEL, ETC.

There is little vernacular information about geography or travel before the year 1400, and Wells is only able to give a few scraps of information, amounting to six items in all. This state of affairs was strikingly changed in the fifteenth century, for references to various places, conditions of travel, means of communication, etc.,

¹ Trin. Coll. Camb. O. 1. 13, f. 77b. Cf. opening words of Ashmole 1438, f. 107.

² Trin. Coll. Camb. R. 14. 32, f. 100.

³ Ashmole 1489, f. 425; Trin. Coll. Camb. O. 2. 13, Book III.

⁴ Ashmole 1438, II, f. 55.

⁵ See Wells, op. cit. p. 430.

⁶ I have listed 25 such items.

⁷ *Promptorium Parvulorum*..., ed. A. Way (Camden Society), 1865, pp. xiii-lxxxvii.

⁸ Op. cit. p. I.

⁹ Op. cit. pp. l-liv.

¹⁰ See, for example, Addit. MSS. 25,238, 37,075; Harleian 1587; Royal MSS. 17. C. xvii; Trinity Coll. Dublin, 605.

¹¹ Addit. MSS. 19,046, f. 20; 32,425, f. 1; 37,075, f. 23; Trinity Coll. Dublin, 430.

¹² Trin. Coll. Camb. O. 5. 4, f. 5.

are commonplaces of *The Paston Letters*, or of *The Stonor Letters*, or of entries in accounts, such as those of the great households of the Rutlands and the Howards.

As for travel overseas we have considerable evidence. Recent years have made available for the first time the remarkable account of Margery Kempe of Lynn who gives the most vivid account of her various pilgrimages to some of the most famous shrines in England and abroad.¹ Then there is an anonymous 'handbook' for travellers across Europe by the Low Lands to Venice and so to the Eastern Mediterranean and home through the Straits of Gibraltar. This gives much advice on practical matters: guides and their habits, the choice of travelling impedimenta, hints as to weather and 'the usance of the hote lands', and how to conduct oneself, for our author tells us that 'englissh men have but littel love in meny parties, but yef hit be for their money, or the better of gouernance'.²

The outstanding book of travel of this century was the well-known *Mandeville's Travels*. This purports to be a guide book for travellers to Jerusalem, but is also an account of the wonders of the East in the realms of the Great Cham, and was in great demand and translated into many languages. At least four versions of the original (which scholars are now generally agreed was in French³) were made during the fifteenth century, and over thirty manuscripts in the vernacular remain.⁴ Other accounts of the pilgrimages both to Rome and Jerusalem also survive. Both verse and prose accounts of what to do and to see in Rome were in circulation before 1480, but eight later manuscripts attest the fame and interest still attaching to this pilgrimage. About 1450, John Capgrave, the famous Augustinian friar of Lynn, wrote an account which went into great detail of the topography, legends and buildings of the Holy City.⁵

5. NATURAL SCIENCE

Seven entries dealing with this subject are recorded by Wells. The first of these concerns the influence of the planets—a subject dealt with in 42 lines of verse in a manuscript of about 1350.⁶ The fifteenth century saw manuscripts in plenty treating of the nature and influence of planets. The signs of the zodiac and their influence on human bodies;⁷ 'the book of Ypocras on planetary influence';⁸ 'the cunning of Ptolemy';⁹ of Alexander,¹⁰ of Alkabucii¹¹ on astrological matters; were available. Men might learn how 'to understand Saturn, the highest planet and the wickedest',¹² or what were the rules of astronomy relating to physic and physicians.¹³

Closely allied were a mass of manuscripts which set out the significance of the months and days in the lives and fortunes of men. From these it could be seen which days were perilous, how many they were in number, and what activities they

¹ *The Book of Margery Kempe*, ed. S. B. Meech (E.E.T.S.), 1940.

² Cottonian MSS. Appendix VIII, f. 108, and printed in *Englische Studien*, VII, 277–84. For the Holy Land and Jerusalem, see W. Wey's *Itineraries* (Roxburghe Club), 1857.

³ The problems connected with the various versions are admirably discussed by Kenneth Sisam in *Fourteenth Century Verse and Prose*, pp. 240–2.

⁴ For a full account of these, see J. Vogels, *Handschriftliche Untersuchungen über die Englische Version Mandeville's*, Crefeld, 1891.

⁵ See *The Solace of Pilgrimes*, ed. C. A. Mills, 1911.

⁶ Wells, *op. cit.* p. 437.

⁷ See Sloane 620, f. 12; 3285, f. 76.

⁸ See Addit. MSS. Brit. Mus. 12,195, item 16; Caius Coll. Camb. 457, f. 77.

⁹ See Sloane 2030, item 5; Caius Coll. Camb. 457, f. 79.

¹⁰ See Sloane 121, item 26.

¹¹ See Trin. Coll. Camb. O. 5. 26, f. 1.

¹² See Sloane 340, item 7.

¹³ See Sloane 213, item 12; 3733, f. 1.

were likely to influence.¹ Other days were lucky, and small treatises discussed these,² or set out how the year was ruled according to the day of the week on which 25 October or 1 January happened to fall.³

Alchemical science also flourished in the fifteenth century. Not only have we to take account of the works of outstanding writers, such as Norton and Ripley, but countless other works in English dealt with various aspects of this subject.⁴

The most valuable indication of the state of knowledge of natural science in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries is afforded by the great encyclopaedia of Bartholomeus Anglicus. His work, *De Proprietatibus Rerum*, was Englished by Trevisa and completed on 6 February 1398, and it remained an authoritative work until the sixteenth century, when it was re-issued with some additions under the title of *Batman upon Bartholomeu*.⁵ The fifteenth century recognized the value of Trevisa's work, and six copies as well as an abstract have survived, and it was also published in an abridged form in 1491 by Wynkyn de Worde, and by Berthelet in 1535.⁶

6. MISCELLANEOUS PIECES

It would be impossible to deal with the fifteenth-century contributions which fall under this heading without hopelessly extending this article. To take the first item: Wells lists 'Eight miscellaneous recipes for making colours; for making iron hard', etc. The fifteenth century saw manuscript after manuscript which included a few recipes of this nature, or which gave up some pages to it. Thus we have recipes for the art of making colours from azure to vermillion;⁷ we can learn how to enamel⁸ or to dye,⁹ to make glue,¹⁰ or 'nesche' glass,¹¹ or ink,¹² or parchment,¹³ or soap,¹⁴ or size,¹⁵ or verdigris.¹⁶ Recipes are given for the preparation of green ginger,¹⁷ or white leather,¹⁸ or red lead,¹⁹ or metheglyn,²⁰ or even how to make the philosopher's stone.²¹ The mysteries of the preparation of salves, ointments or syrups are made clear,²² while 'a series of tracts instructs the cook and the confectioner in their art'. What courses to provide for a king's table, bills of fare for various occasions and culinary recipes are the subject matter of at least a dozen manuscripts of this period.²³

¹ See Rawl. C. 81, f. 58; Sloane 393, f. 73; 1315, f. 33; 3285, f. 84.

² See Royal 12. E. xvi, f. 51; Sloane 2584, f. 60.

³ See Harleian 2252, f. 154; Royal 12. E. xvi, f. 3; Sloane 340, item 6.

⁴ The manuscripts dealing with this topic are very fully listed by Mrs D. W. Singer in her monumental *Catalogue of Latin and Vernacular Alchemical Manuscripts in Great Britain and Ireland dating from before the XVI Century*, Brussels, 1930.

⁵ *Batman upon Bartholome, His Booke De Proprietatibus Rerum, Newly corrected, enlarged and amended* . . . , 1582.

⁶ The six copies are as follows: Addit. MSS. 27,944; Harleian 614 and 4789; Bodleian E. Mus. 16; Tollemach, Helmingdon Hall; New York, Plimpton 263 (formerly Middleton 7). The abstract is in Sloane 983, f. 81.

⁷ The original sources are very fully set out in an article by D. V. Thompson, 'Trial index for mediaeval craftsmanship', *Speculum*, x, 410-31.

⁸ Sloane 1584, f. 39.

⁹ Sloane 73, f. 196; Egerton 2852, f. 4.

¹⁰ Harleian 665, f. 1; 2390, f. 80.

¹¹ Sloane 73, f. 201.

¹² Trin. Coll. Camb. R. 14. 46, f. 79; Sloane 122, f. 90; 345, f. 34.

¹³ Harleian 218, f. 71; Cotton, Julius, D. viii, f. 88; Sloane 73, f. 197.

¹⁴ Sloane 73, f. 191; 140, f. 8.

¹⁵ Sloane 1764, f. 4; Harleian 2390, f. 80.

¹⁶ Sloane 122, f. 71; 962, f. 152.

¹⁷ Ashmole 1477, f. 51.

¹⁸ Sloane 73, f. 197.

¹⁹ Sloane 73, f. 170; Trin. Coll. Camb. R. 14. 45, f. 77.

²⁰ Sloane 1698, f. 37; Addit. MSS. 14,252, f. 114.

²¹ Harleian 853, f. 127; Camb. Univ. Lib. Ee. 1. 13, f. 148.

²² Sloane 73, f. 95; 692, f. 56; 706, f. 137.

²³ Sloane 7, f. 93; 122, f. 95; 442, f. 6; Harleian 279, f. 50; 1605, f. 98; Ashmole 1439, f. 2. For more references and a brief account of other miscellaneous pieces, see my article mentioned above, *R.E.S.* xix, 117.

7. CHARMS

To the three items listed by Wells much evidence from the fifteenth century could be added. Treatises ostensibly concerned with purely medical matters are often found to contain much that is mere charlatanry. A perfectly sound medical prescription is followed by one that relies on magic for its effectiveness.¹ Innumerable manuscripts of this period contain charms, sometimes noted down on fly-leaves or in vacant spaces,² but often assuming more serious dimensions.³ The day was still far distant when medicine and magic were to part company.

8. DREAM BOOKS

Wells mentions two works on dreams, one in verse and one in prose, and both of these circulated in the fifteenth century. The first survives in various forms in a number of manuscripts,⁴ while the prose version has also been preserved in three manuscripts.⁵

9. DOCUMENTS

Wells gives references to a number of documents of various kinds which were written in England before 1400. This date is something more than one of convenience when writings of this class are concerned, for there can be no doubt that the first quarter of the fifteenth century saw the practice of centuries reversed and documents of every class, hitherto written in Latin or French, now begin to appear in English. Letters, proclamations, wills, ordinances, petitions—all take an English form, so that before the century is far advanced English has become the accepted medium of communication for the majority of purposes.⁶ Henceforward the increase in the use of English is so rapid and so widespread that it would be a well-nigh impossible task to list the vernacular output.

The evidence here presented in outline may fairly be said to present a *prima facie* case for a belief that 'the empty fifteenth century' is but an ignorant rhetorical flourish. On the contrary, we may assert that this century was one which saw knowledge of every kind becoming rapidly available to all who could read in their own native tongue.

H. S. BENNETT

CAMBRIDGE

¹ See Addit. MSS. 12,195, 37,786, f. 43; Caius Coll. Camb. 457, f. 8.

² See Rawl. B. 171, f. 228; Rawl. C. 506, passim; Harleian 1600, f. 4; 2389, ff. 26, 42, 51.

³ See Sloane 122, ff. 36-68, 114-19, 162-6; 147, ff. 36-79.

⁴ For the '*Lunationes et Somnia*' or '*Somnia Danieli*' see Harleian 3725, f. 66; Royal 12. E. xvi, f. 51. The version known as the '*Storia*

Lune' is found in Harleian 1735, f. 1; Sloane 635, f. 1; 1315, f. 49; Digby 1089, f. 64a, etc.

⁵ Royal 12. E. xvi, f. 1; Sloane 1609, f. 29; Trin. Coll. Camb. O. 9. 37, f. 26.

⁶ Reference for information concerning one area may be made to the work of R. W. Chambers and M. Daunt, *A Book of London English*, 1384-1425.

AN EXPERIMENT IN MEMORIAL RECONSTRUCTION

Of all the hypotheses advanced to account for the puzzling condition of the first Quarto of *Hamlet* and to explain its relationship to the authentic Shakespearian texts which followed it, perhaps the most acceptable on the score of cautious, detailed analysis which leaves as little as possible to undocumented assumption, is that of Dr George Ian Duthie in his recent book *The 'Bad' Quarto of 'Hamlet'*.¹ He says that the Q₁ text post-dates the authentic Shakespearian texts published later; that practically the whole content of it is dependent upon the full Shakespearian text of Q₂ or a stage version of it; and that it is a memorial reconstruction made by an actor who had the part of Marcellus, and who was able to write acceptable blank verse of his own when his memory failed him.

Therefore, in his treatment of the corrupted text of the *Hamlet* Q₁, Dr Duthie ascribes most of its variations from the authentic version to the faulty operation of the reporter's memory, and by detailed analysis demonstrates that almost all the blank verse peculiar to Q₁ consists 'of various fragments gathered together from widely separated source-passages and woven into a complex metrical whole'.²

But a question intrudes itself here. When an actor with a small part is attempting a memorial reconstruction of a play in which he has appeared, does his memory work in the fashion postulated by Dr Duthie?

It was in an attempt to answer this question that I undertook the experiment which is the subject of this article.

In October, the Columbia University Theatre Associates presented a play by Court Chamberlain, entitled *Witch Hunt*; a play which has not been published so that the cast had access only to their own manuscript 'sides'.³ With the assistance of Miss Lillian Pierson, who had the small part of Sarah, a maidservant, I made a memorial reconstruction of three sections of the play.

The result demonstrates that the types of variant between the authentic text and the reconstructed version of *Witch Hunt* are identical with the variants found in the full and 'debased' versions of *Hamlet*. These variants include the omission of a short intervening line and the running together of speeches originally separated; the anticipation of a word or line and its omission from its rightful place; the transposition of clauses in a sentence; the assigning of lines to the wrong characters, and others which will be considered in detail as they appear.

Here are the parallel texts of the first reconstructed fragment:⁴

Q₁

Burroughs. All gone, boy? Fetch t'other.

Nath. It's all gone. There be no more peary. 'Twas a bad year for pears.

Nath. No. You do know that Mistress Morton says that the drink that you end with must be the same as the drink that you begin with.

Authentic text

Burroughs. All gone, boy?

Nathaniel. Aye

Bur. Fetch t'other barrel. I'll help.

Nath. 'Tis the last of the peary. It was a bad year for pears.

Nath. Mistress do not allow that, Goodman Burroughs. The drink what you end on must be same as what you begin on.

¹ George Ian Duthie, *The 'Bad' Quarto of 'Hamlet'*, Cambridge University Press, 1941.

² Duthie, op. cit. p. 95.

³ I am indebted to the kindness of Associate Professor Milton Smith of the Speech Department

of Columbia University, for the loan of the manuscript book of the play.

⁴ For the sake of convenient reference, I shall call the memorial reconstruction of *Witch Hunt* quarto one (Q₁).

Q₁

Bur. The peary be weak like water and the cider be no better.

Nath. Mistress Morton! Mistress Morton! (*exit*)

Bur. Be I to sit with an empty tankard? I be an Englishman, I be. (*exit*)
(*enter Nath. followed by Elizabeth Morton*)

Eliz. What is't, Nathaniel?

Nath. It be that Goodman Burroughs again. He did finish off the peary and now is drinking cider.

Eliz. Tell him I would speak with him.
(*enter Burroughs*)

Eliz. Goodman Burroughs, that cider is the strongest in Massachusetts. You know if you do get drunk I do lose my license. That drink will cost you twice its usual cost and it is your last drink at the Golden Lioness today.

Bur. I am not drunk.

In the first two lines of Q₁ here, the reporter has omitted Nathaniel's short intervening line, so that Burrough's originally separated lines are run together as one speech. There are several examples of this type of memorial error in *Hamlet* Q₁. Consider the following parallel texts from Q₁ and the authentic *Hamlet*:¹

vii, 8-14

Cor. Now my good Lord, do you know me?

Ham. Yea very well, y'are a fishmonger

Cor. Not I my Lord

Ham. Then sir, I would you were so honest a man
For to be honest, as this age goes
Is one man to be pickt out of tenne thousand

ix, 79-81

Queene. Hamlet come sit downe by me,

Ham. No by my faith mother, heere's a mettle more attractive:
Lady will you giue me leaue, and so forth:²
To lay my head in your lappe?

¹ In the close word for word comparison which was necessary for this paper, I found it most convenient to use the scene and line numbering of the reprint of Q₁ in vol. ix of the old *Cambridge Shakespeare* (ed. William Aldis Wright, London, 1893) and the act, scene and line numbering of the authentic *Hamlet* text in vol. vii of the same edition. All references to scene and line only are to Q₁.

² The phrase 'and so forth' is puzzling here.

Authentic text

Bur. And be I to sit with empty tankard? The peary is weak like water. The cider do be no better.

Nath. Mistress Morton! (*exit Nath.*)

Bur. And be I to sit with empty tankard! I be an Englishman, I be. (*exit*)
[*detailed stage direction to same effect*]

Eliz. What is't, Nathaniel?

Nath. That Goodman Burroughs! He have finished off the peary, and now he do be drinking cider!

Eliz. Tell him I would speak with him.

Bur. (*entering*) Here I be mistress.

Eliz. Goodman, that cider is the most powerful in Massachusetts. 'Tis your last drink here today in the Golden Lioness, and it will cost you four times its usual price.

Bur. But mistress...

Eliz. If you do leave here drunk, I lose my license.

Bur. I ben't drunk.

ii, ii, 173-8

Pol. Do you know me, my lord?

Ham. Excellent well; you are a fishmonger.

Pol. Not I, my lord.

Ham. Then I would you were so honest a man.

Pol. Honest, my lord!

Ham. Ay, sir; to be honest, as this world goes, is to be one man picked out of ten thousand.

iii, ii, 105-8

Queen. Come hither, my dear Hamlet, sit by me

Ham. No, good mother, here's metal more attractive.

Pol. O, ho! do you mark that?

Ham. Lady, shall I lie in your lap?

Although it does occur elsewhere in Shakespeare, in these other cases it is either an addition to an itemized list (*Twelfth Night*, i, v, 228-32; iii, iv, 64-70; 2 *Henry IV*, v, iii, 1-3; *Hamlet*, ii, i, 55-62), a substitution for an indecent word (*Winter's Tale*, i, ii, 218) or the conclusion of an unfinished quotation (*Love's Labour's Lost*, iv, ii, 89). Here it would seem to be just another indication of the memorial nature of Q₁.

Q₁

Authentic text

xi, 134-6

King. Now sonne Hamlet, where is this dead body?

Ham. At supper, not where he is eating, but where he is eaten...

iv, iii, 17-20

King. Now, Hamlet, where's Polonius?

Ham. At supper.

King. At supper! where?

Ham. Not where he eats, but where he is eaten:¹

In Nathaniel's first line in Q₁ the first phrase does not belong to him at all. This confusion as to who spoke a remembered line or phrase can be found in *Hamlet* Q₁:

iv, 1-2

Ham. The ayre bites shrewd; it is an eager and An nipping winde, what houre i'st?

I, iv, 1-3

Ham. The air bites shrewdly; it is very cold.

Hor. It is a nipping and an eager air.

Ham. What hour now?

Other examples are the Queen's lines in v, i, 278-82 which in Q₁ xvi, 160-3 are spoke mistakenly by the King; Marcellus's line in i, v, 115, which is allocated to Horatio in iv, 154; another of the Queen's lines II, ii, 168, which is again given to the King in vi, 111; and finally in III, ii, 259, 264, Ophelia's line 'The King rises!' which is incorrectly added to Polonius's 'Lights, lights, lights!' at the corresponding point in Q₁, producing the line at ix, 175, 'Cor. The king rises, lights hoe'.

The next error in *Witch Hunt* Q₁ occurs in Nathaniel's next speech, where the reporter substitutes a familiar preposition 'begin with' for the somewhat unusual 'begin on'. There is an interesting example of this type of error in the two *Hamlet* texts:

ii, 44-5

King. It is a fault against heauen, fault against the dead,
A fault against nature....

I, ii, 101-2

King. Fie! 'tis a fault to heaven,
A fault against the dead, a fault to nature....

In Burroughs's retort to Nathaniel's reminder, the reporter has omitted, in Q₁, the first phrase which, it should be noticed, is repeated verbatim in his next speech. This omission of one incidence of a repeated line can be found in *Hamlet* Q₁:

i, 7-10

Hor. Friends to this ground
Mar. And leegemen to the Dane,
O farewell honest souldier, who hath re-
leued you!
1. (*Fran.*). Barnarda hath my place, giue
you good night.

I, i, 15-17

Hor. Friends to this ground
Mar. And liegemen to the Dane
Fran. Give you good night.
Mar. O, farewell, honest soldier:
Who hath relieved you?
Fran. Barnardo hath my place.
Give you goodnight.²

The next error occurs in Elizabeth's rebuke to Burroughs. The line, 'If you do leave here drunk, I lose my license', is misplaced in Q₁. It belongs a line or two further down. This anticipation of a line is a frequent occurrence in the 'bad' text of *Hamlet* and, combined with the peculiar difficulties attendant upon the shorthand

¹ See also xi, 62-5 and III, iv, 103-6; xvi, 128 and v, i, 217-19.

² See also III, iv, 88, 94 and xi, 47, 50; v, i, 194, 196 and xvi, 115, 117.

system in use at the time,¹ effectively disposes of the stenographic theory of reporting:

Q₁

v, 12-14

Mon. (Reyn.) My lord, that will impeach his reputation.

Cor. (Pol.) I faith not a whit, no not a whit,

Now happely hee closeth with you in the consequence....

Authentic text

II, i, 27-30

Rey. My lord, that would dishonour him.

Pol. Faith no; as you may season it in the charge

You must not put another scandal on him, That he is open to incontinency....

II, i, 43-5

Pol. Having ever seen in the pre-nominate crimes

The youth you breathe of guilty, be assured

He closes with you in this consequence;

III, i, 115-20

Ham. ...I did love you once.

Oph. Indeed, my lord, you made me believe so.

Ham. You should not have believed me; for virtue cannot so inoculate our old stock but we shall relish of it: I loved you not.

Oph. I was the more deceived.²

vi, 162-4

Ham. I neuer loued you.

Ofel. You made me beleeeue you did

Ham. O thou shouldst not a beleeeued me!

To return to *Witch Hunt*, Elizabeth's rebuke to Burroughs contains in its last sentence an interesting error in the transposition of the clauses composing it. Now consider the following from the *Hamlet* texts:

iv, 65

Ham. Ile go no farther, whither wilt thou leade me?

I, v, 1

Ham. Whither wilt thou lead me? speak; I'll go no further.

vi, 19-20

Cor. My Lord, the Ambassadors are ioyfully
Return'd from Norway.

II, ii, 40-1

Pol. The ambassadors from Norway,
my good lord,
Are joyfully return'd.

ix, 205

Ham. You would seeme to know my stops, you would play vpon mee...

III, ii, 355

Ham. You would play upon me; you would seem to know my stops;

In that same sentence of Elizabeth's, the reporter has made another mistake. Whereas the authentic text has 'four times' *Witch Hunt* Q₁ has 'twice'. This numerical error is common in *Hamlet* Q₁:

ix, 100

Duke. Full fortie yeares are past, their date is gone.

III, ii, 150

P. King. Full thirty times hath Phoebeus' cart gone round

¹ G. I. Duthie, op. cit. pp. 12-26.

² See also v, 57 which should correspond to II, i, 107 but which is actually inserted after the line corresponding to II, i, 84.

Q₁

Authentic text

xvi, 72-3

Ham. ...by the Lord Horatio,
This seauen yeares haue I noted it....

v, i, 134-5

Ham. By the Lord, Horatio, this three
years I have taken note of it;

xvi, 107

Ham. ...he hath caried mee twenty
times vpon his backe,

v, i, 181

Ham. ...he hath borne me on his back
a thousand times;¹

The second reconstructed fragment repeats many of the errors found in the first, and so I shall quote here only that part of it which introduces a new type of memorial mistake, the anticipation of a whole section of dialogue:

Eliza. Come now, the book

Charles. 'Tis a book I have especially
kept from you. 'Tis by one Shakespeare.

Eliza. Shakespeare! In London I did
see a play by him. 'Twas called *Macbeth*.
A terrible tragedy and yet I did enjoy it

Charles. Well, this be poetry. Does that
please you?

Eliza. Should I say I prefer a sermon?
Char. Then indeed Mr. Williams' visit
had a strange effect on you. Did you hear
this in London?

When in disgrace with fortune and men's
eyes

I all alone beweepe my outcast state

Eliza. The book. What is it?

Charles. 'Tis a book I've been keeping
from you.

Eliza. Cruel! What is it?

Charles. Poetry. Does that please you?

Eliza. Should I say I prefer a sermon?

Char. Then Mr Williams' visit had a
strange effect. Why did he come?

Eliza. That story can wait. You tor-
ment me about the book.

Charles. This poetry is by one Shake-
speare.

Eliza. Shakespeare. In London I once
saw a play by him. *Macbeth*. A dreadful
tragedy, and yet I did enjoy it.

Charles. Did you hear this in London?
When in disgrace...etc.

This misplacing of a whole section of dialogue can be found in very many places in *Hamlet* Q₁:

III, iv, 156-8

Queen. O Hamlet, thou has cleft my heart in twain.

Ham. O, throw away the worser part of it,
And live the purer with the other half.

In Q₁ these lines appear at xi, 59-61, some fifty lines earlier in the scene, and before the entrance of the Ghost, instead of after it, as in the authentic texts. Then again, the dialogue at III, ii, 328-32:

Ros. Good my lord, what is your cause of distemper?...

Ham. Sir, I lack advancement.

Ros. How can that be....

occurs in Q₁ at vii, 53-6, which approximates II, ii, 291 in the full version.²

The third reconstructed fragment is a long one, so I shall deal with it in sections, omitting as far as possible those parts which contain only errors which have already been dealt with:

¹ See also xvi, 151 and v, i, 263.

² See also iv, ii, 12-20 which, occurring at ix, 211-21, is in that situation actually at III, ii,

363 ff.; and III, v, 185-95, which is at xiii, 30-40 or iv, v, 39 ff.; and then iv, vii, 25-6, which is put at xiii, 114-15 or iv, v, 197-8.

Q₁

Will. I have finished with this

Sar. Aye, sir.

Will. I wish to rehearse my sermon. I do not wish to be disturbed, unless I am needed upstairs. Can Mistress Williams have anything to eat?

Sar. The midwife don't want her to eat sir.

Will. I see.

Sar. What when Mr. Moody come from Boston, sir?

Will. Show him into the study at once.

Sar. Aye, sir. (*exit*)
(*Prudence knocks*)

Will. Who's there?

Pru. 'Tis only me, sir. You did say I might listen again to your sermon.

Authentic text

Will. I have finished with this.

Sar. Aye, sir.

Will. I wish to work on my sermon. Let no one disturb me. Unless I am needed upstairs.

Sar. Aye, sir.

Will. Could Mistress Williams eat anything?

Sar. The midwife don't want her to eat, sir.

Will. I see.

Sar. What when Mr. Moody arrive from Boston, sir?

Will. Call me at once.

Sar. Aye, sir. (*exit*)
(*Prudence knocks*)

Will. Who's there?

Pru. 'Tis only me, sir. You did say that again this Friday I might hear you rehearse your sermon.

The word *rehearse*, placed in the first line of Williams's second speech in Q₁, does not belong there at all. It is an anticipation of the word which belongs rightfully in Prudence's last speech, from where it is omitted in the reconstructed version. *Hamlet* Q₁ has some interesting examples of this anticipation of a word and its omission from its proper place.

ix, 1

Ham. Pronounce me this speech trippingly a the tongue as I taught thee,

III, ii, 1

Ham. Speak the speech, I pray you, as I pronounced it to you, trippingly on the tongue:

And in II, ii, 578-9, Hamlet says:

Why, what an ass am I! This is most brave,
That I, the sone of a dear father murder'd....

The word *ass* is missing from the corresponding place in Q₁, being anticipated at vii, 217, which corresponds to II, ii, 562:

Yet I like to an asse and Iohn a Dreames....

And there are still further examples:

iv, 103-4

Ghost. O wicked will, and gifts! that
have the power
So to seduce my most seeming vertuous
Queene,

I, v, 44-6

Ghost. O wicked wit and gifts, that
have the power
So to seduce!—won to his shameful lust
The will of my most seeming-virtuous
queen:

iii, 54

Cor. So well as befits my honor, and
your credite.

I, iii, 97

Pol. As it behoves my daughter and
your honour.¹

The last reconstructed fragment, while unavoidably containing some errors that have been commented upon before, presents two additional mistakes.

¹ See also i, 1 and I, i, 14; ix, 74, 78 and III, ii, 99, 103.

Q₁

Eliz. Know you not the dullness that lies ahead for these men on the long winter nights? They have nothing to do but drink.

Will. That time might be better spent (like me) on their knees in prayer.

Eliz. They are simple men whose sins are confessed in a moment.

Will. Do you imply, madam, that mine take hours to confess?

Elizabeth's first sentence here presents an error of the type dealt with by Dr Duthie in his treatment of the blank verse peculiar to Q₁; that is, it consists of fragments imperfectly remembered from widely separated sections of the full text and woven into an intelligible whole. The words *lies* and *winter* are remembered from Elizabeth's later speech (omitted altogether in the reconstructed version):

Remember that a bear may *lie* in a hole through the *winter*, with food for neither mind nor body....

and also perhaps from a much earlier scene between Elizabeth and Williams, where Williams says:

For though snakes *lie* idle all *winter* in their holes, yet the old serpent is as busy as ever.

The last error to be dealt with arises from a revision made by my reporter when an inconsistency indicated that something had been left out. It occurs in Williams's line:

That time might be better spent like me on their knees in prayer.

This line was originally remembered as follows:

That time might be better spent on their knees in prayer.

But the next lines:

Eliz. They are simple men whose sins are confessed in a moment.

Will. Do you imply, madam, that mine take hours to confess?

troubled my reporter, because although she was absolutely sure of them (and they are the only ones in this section which are accurate), she realized that they did

Authentic text

Eliz. Know you not what these long cold months mean to common men? They have naught but drink and worse amusements to turn to.

Will. After billiards and bowls, you will ask next for dancing. The dancer, madam, breaks all the ten commandments of God.

Eliz. I'll not ask for dancing, Mr. Williams. Only the games.

Will. My answer must be no.

Eliz. Don't answer at once. Consider it. Remember that a bear may lie in a hole through the winter, with food for neither mind nor body, but men are different.

Will. Assuredly men are different. That time you would have them spend in gaming, they had better spend upon their knees.

Eliz. They'll never do that.

Will. I find no more profitable way of spending my time.

Eliz. But they are simple men, whose simple sins are confessed in a moment.

Will. Do you mean that my sins take me hours to confess?

not follow naturally and logically what had gone before. She therefore inserted the words 'like me' in a suitable place in the preceding line, producing:

That time might be better spent *like me* on their knees in prayer.

Now this is an awkward, ungrammatical and loosely expressed line, not at all typical of the measured, somewhat pedantic utterances of Mr Williams, and bears quite clearly the marks of a disjuncting revision.

Now consider these passages from the two *Hamlet* texts:

Q₁
xi, 138-146
Ham. Father, your fatte King, and
your leane Beggar
Are but variable seruices, two dishes to
one messe:
Looke you, a man may fish with that
worme
That hath eaten of a King,
And a Beggar eate that fish,
Which that worme hath caught.
King. What of this?
Ham. Nothing father, but to tell you,
how a King
May go a progresse through the guttes of
a Beggar.

Authentic text
iv, iii, 23-31
Ham. . . . your fat king and your lean
beggar is but variable service, two dishes,
but to one table: that's the end.
King. Alas, alas!
Ham. A man may fish with the worm
that hath eat of a king, and eat of the
fish that hath fed of that worm.
King. What dost thou mean by this?
Ham. Nothing but to show you how a
king may go a progress through the guts
of a beggar.

The lines:

And a Beggar eate that fish
Which that worme hath caught

are the only two lines here which differ materially in Q₁ from the authentic text. They are awkward, jerky, pedestrian lines, constituting a distinct break in the rhythm of that speech. It is evident that the reporter, coming to the phrase

through the guttes of a Beggar,

realized that the 'Beggar' had not been previously mentioned, and therefore returned to Hamlet's preceding speech and inserted the word 'Beggar' in what seemed the most appropriate place.

The same thing occurs in xi of Q₁, which, in the imperfect text, follows immediately upon the Closet Scene. This corresponds to iv, iii in the authentic text (which is, however, separated from the Closet Scene by iv, ii), which takes place not, as in Q₁, in the Queen's bedroom, but in a hall of the castle. In this scene, in both texts, the lines occur:

Ham. Farewell, dear mother.

King. Thy loving father, Hamlet.

Ham. My mother: father and mother is man and wife; man and wife is one flesh, and so, my mother.¹

At the end of this scene in both texts the King utters a soliloquy in which he reveals to the audience his plot against Hamlet's life. Obviously, this speech would not be spoken in the Queen's presence. Here the reporter is faced with a double confusion. Having omitted the intervening scene (iv, ii) between Hamlet and the

¹ That is, the content, which is all that is important here, is the same. The actual wording differs slightly. See Q₁, xi, 161-5.

two courtiers, Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, which removes the action from the Queen's bedroom to another part of the castle, the reporter runs iv, i and iv, iii together in Q₁ xi, the whole scene mistakenly taking place in the Queen's room, without removing her from the stage. The error is accentuated, or even possibly caused, by a misunderstanding of Hamlet's subtly derisive farewell quoted above, which Shakespeare addressed to the King, but which the reporter evidently thought was spoken to the Queen. He therefore finds it necessary to get rid of the Queen somehow before the King's soliloquy, and so at xi, 166 we have the King's line:

Gertred, leaue me,

which does not appear at all in the authentic text, and which, abrupt, uncivil, and distinctly different from the King's usual courtesy to his wife, is strikingly out of place just before the measured lines which follow it.¹

There is necessarily some difference involved in the reconstruction of a play like *Witch Hunt* and the memorial reconstruction of *Hamlet*. For one thing, *Hamlet* is mostly in blank verse. It might be interesting to notice here that *Witch Hunt* has a species of substitute for the blank verse of *Hamlet* in its distinct seventeenth-century verbal idiom, which probably presented almost as much difficulty to my reporter's memory as did the blank verse of *Hamlet* to its reporter. It can be seen throughout the quoted parallel texts of both plays, that the effort involved led my reporter to cast her sentences in the old idiom when they were actually modern in construction in the authentic text, and that probably a similar effort was responsible for the fact that parts of Q₁ are written as verse which appear as prose in the authentic version.

There is also the fact that in any non-professional performance the actor is too much concerned about his own cues and lines to pay much attention to what the other characters are saying, and so the level of reporting while Sarah is on the stage is no better than when she is not, whereas the professional actor who took the part of Marcellus was most likely troubled by no such preoccupation. The level of the reporting while Marcellus is on the stage is very much higher than at any other time.²

Otherwise, I think it is interesting to find that the types of variant in the imperfect and authentic texts of *Hamlet*, attributed by Dr Duthie to the faulty memory of a hypothetical reporter making a deduced memorial reconstruction, are identical with the variants in the imperfect and authentic texts of *Witch Hunt*, which are known to be due to the faulty memory of an actual reporter making a deliberate memorial reconstruction.

BETTY SHAPIN

NEW YORK

¹ For other indications of revision in *Hamlet* Q₁, see Duthie, op. cit. pp. 150-64. The instances I have cited are not mentioned by Dr Duthie.

² Professor O. J. Campbell of the Graduate English Faculty of Columbia University, for whose advice and encouragement I can never be sufficiently grateful, has been kind enough to

suggest that in spite of all the differences between *Hamlet* and *Witch Hunt*, the memorial reconstruction of the latter play is more valid as an experiment than would be an attempt to reconstruct *Hamlet* to-day, because of the fact that the printed text of *Hamlet* is so widely known.

THE FISHER KING

The mysterious world which makes the setting of the story is the world of the dead; the idea of death dominates everything, and everything reveals it. All Celtic literature suggests mystery with a rare power of evocation.

HENRI HUBERT

The riddle of the Grail is still awaiting its solution, in spite of the many attempts made by scholars more competent than ourselves. Only one thing is reasonably certain: the story of Perceval is based on a folk-tale motive of considerable diffusion: the theme of the *Frustrated Redemption*.¹ The element common to all tales of this type is the presence of two protagonists: a youth in quest of adventures and a supernatural being (spectre, bewitched prince or princess), frequently plunged into a magic sleep in some inaccessible place (cave, enchanted castle, etc.).

In Chrétien's *Conte du Graal* this supernatural being appears to Perceval first in the form of a fisherman in a boat, subsequently in that of a mortally wounded king who yet cannot find redemption from his sufferings by welcome death. The fisherman is called, without any preparation whatever, the 'rich fisher' and the 'Fisher King'; but nowhere is a plausible explanation of these rather strange names furnished to the reader. Every enquiry into the origin and meaning of the Grail must therefore begin with the question: 'Who is the Fisher King?'

All students of mythology know the importance of epithets and cult titles referring to gods, demons, and heroes: they, more than any other feature, are apt to throw light on the character, origin, and history of a given divinity. We are thus led to look for the bearing of the epithet 'rich' in the texts under discussion. We have noted that Chrétien uses it without attempting to explain it. It is therefore likely that he found it unexplained in the text that was his model. That there was no satisfactory explanation known may also be inferred from the large number of explanations invented *ad hoc* by Chrétien's successors. It goes without saying that they are worthless for our problem. It is also well to point out that thus far the true meaning of this puzzling epithet has not been discovered.²

This is the more astonishing because the true meaning is fairly obvious: 'rich' is the equivalent of Lat. *dives*, *dis*, which is the most common epithet of the god of the lower world, known by his euphemistic name of *Dispater*. It is equally well known that the name of this ancient divinity survived in Dante's *Città di Dite*. The Latin epithet, on the other hand, is merely a loan translation of the Gr. *Πλούτος*, a word designating the god of the shades,³ for the differentiation of *Πλούτων*, the god of the dead, and *Πλούτος*, the god of wealth, is clearly secondary.

¹ The first to see the true character of the story was, it seems, E. Wechssler, *Die Sage vom heiligen Gral*, Halle, 1898, pp. 30, 129 n. 39, 161 n. 84. Cp. also G. Ehrismann, in *Beiträge zur Geschichte d. deutschen Spr. u. Lit.* xxx (1914), 48; my book *Balor with the Evil Eye*, New York, 1927, pp. 106 ff.; Paul Hagen, *Der Gral*, Strassburg, 1900, p. 84.

² Cf., e.g., Wechssler, op. cit. p. 130: 'Die Bezeichnung "reicher Fischer" hat christlich-symbolische Bedeutung=Menschenfischer. . . . Dieser Name des Gralhüters stammt also aus der christlichen Symbolik und nicht, wie sämtliche Graldichter erzählen, daher, dass der alte

Gralkönig dem Gralsucher auf einem Flusse fischend erschien.' Cp. also *Parzival* von Wolfram v. Eschenbach, neu bearbeitet v. W. Hertz, Stuttgart-Berlin, 1904, pp. 427 f.; Helaine Newstead, *Bran the Blessed in Arthurian Romance*, New York, 1939, p. 40; W. A. Nitze, *P.M.L.A.* xxiv (1909), 380: 'The epithet "rich", doubtless applied early to the Fisher King, is possibly emblematic of his creative function, though it is of course a royal epithet.'

³ Cicero, *de nat. deor.* ii, 26. 66: 'Terrena autem vis omnis atque natura Diti patri dedicata est (qui Dives, ut apud Graecos Πλούτων), quia et recidunt omnia in terras et oriuntur e terris.'

Nor is this all. "Ἀδμητος, 'the Invincible', a heroic form of the god of the lower world¹—he is the father of Hecate²—is the rich owner of vast flocks which Apollo himself condescends to pasture.³

The curious association of *Πλούτων* and *Πλούτος* was equally familiar to the ancient Celts. The *Book of the Dun Cow* contains, *inter alia*, an account of Cuchulainn's descent to the shades, where he and his companions carry off three wonder cows and a magic cauldron which furnishes abundance of meat, and treasures of gold and silver into the bargain.⁴ The ancient Welsh knew a divinity named *Máth*, a word meaning 'coin', 'silver', 'treasure', hence the exact equivalent of Gr. *Πλούτος*. The *mabinogi* which goes under his name tells how Pryderi obtains the first domestic swine from Annwn, the world of the dead, whose king is Arawn, evidently the Welsh Hades.⁵

It is not difficult to discover the true reason for this association of the god of the lower world with wealth: as Mephisto, who is only the Christian and medieval successor of the ancient king of the shades, put it:

Full many a lovely place I know
And many a treasure buried long ago....

In the second place it must be remembered that the god of the shades, who is also the god of the soil, was naturally looked upon by the ancient agriculturist as the giver of rich crops. Lastly, the primitive barns in all Mediterranean lands,⁶ and also in Celtic countries,⁷ in Germany,⁸ nay, even in East Africa,⁹ were subterranean silos. The archaeologists of the last century called them 'treasure houses', not altogether a misnomer if we recall the importance of these storehouses for the societies in question.

The epithet 'rich' would thus appear to indicate the chthonian character of the Fisher King.

The research of the late Jessie L. Weston¹⁰ and of Dr Robert Eisler¹¹ has shed much light upon the character and functions of the Fisher King. The wise Adapa, son of Ea, in Babylonian mythology, Višnu and Buddha, lastly Orpheus, all were fishermen, whence Miss Weston inferred, with a good deal of justice, that any mythological figure bearing the title of 'fisherman' is for this reason a supernatural being, a god or a hero.¹²

However this may be, it is logical to think that a divine fisherman is the natural god of a fishing population, that he is closely connected with the sea, and that he

¹ K. O. Müller, *Prolegomena zu einer wissenschaftlichen Mythologie*, Göttingen, 1825, pp. 300 ff.; A. Klinz, *ἱερὸς Γάμος*, Halle, 1933, pp. 70 ff.

² Hesych. s.v. Ἀδμητροῦ κόρη.

³ U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Isyllos von Epidauros*, Berlin, 1886, p. 57 ff.; *Griechische Tragödien*, III (1906), 71 ff.

⁴ Charles Squire, *The Mythology of the British Islands*, London, 1905, p. 176.

⁵ Ibid. p. 260; J. Rhys, *Lectures on Welsh Philology*, London, 1879, p. 414.

⁶ Victor Hehn, *Italien*, Berlin, 1892, p. 22; J. T. Bent, *The Cyclades*, London, 1885, p. 454; W. W. Fowler, *Roman Essays and Interpretations*, Oxford, 1920, p. 28; A. Jeremias, *Das Alte Testament im Lichte des Alten Orients*, Leipzig,

1930, p. 722; E. Westermarck, *Ritual and Belief in Morocco*, London, 1926, I, 191; II, 242.

⁷ C. Elton, *Origins of English History*, London, 1882, p. 33; Henri Hubert, *The Greatness and Decline of the Celts*, London, 1934, p. 250.

⁸ Tacitus, *Germ.* c. 16.

⁹ Sir James G. Frazer, *Anthologia anthropologica. The Native Races of Africa and Madagascar*, London, 1938, p. 33, col. 2.

¹⁰ *The Quest of the Holy Grail*, London, 1913, p. 95; *From Ritual to Romance*, Cambridge, 1920, pp. 118 ff.

¹¹ *Orpheus—the Fisher*, London, 1921, pp. 20 ff., 42 ff.; *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, xxxix (1936), col. 721 ff.

¹² *Quest*, loc. cit.

shares the character and functions of marine divinities in general. To cite only one example out of many: The fishermen of modern Greece know a sea-god, half man, half fish, riding on a dolphin or in a chariot drawn by dolphins. He, too, is said to possess immense wealth, since he is the owner of everything lost at sea. In fact, he is said to sleep on piles of gold.¹ We thus have here a 'rich' fisher in the role of the ancient Poseidon, god of the sea.

Without going as far as Greece, let us recall that the ancient Irish worshipped a deity called Tethra, of whom more anon. The glosses translate this name by *muir*, 'sea, ocean', and in the story of Cuchulainn's visit to the home of Emer (in the *Tochmarc Émir*) mention is made of the plain and the herdsman of Tethra. The text adds that the Plain of Tethra is a *kenning* for 'sea', that Tethra's cattle are the fish of the sea, and that the herdsman is a fisherman.² Tethra would then be both a rich king and a fisher god.

Another fisher god of the ancient Celts was Manannan mac Lir, who gave his name to the Isle of Man. A divine fisherman with a pointed cap is depicted in the sanctuary of the Celtic god Nodon, brought to light at Lydney Park on the bank of the Severn.³

On the other hand, there are very curious connexions between the *Conte du Graal* and the sea. The Grail castle is situated on the seashore beyond a navigable river. The Grail itself, if not identical with one of the marvellous cauldrons attributed to sea divinities, not only of the Celts, but also of the ancient Greeks and Scandinavians,⁴ is very probably derived from this concept.⁵ Lastly, the name of the Fisher King in the *Joseph* of Robert de Borron is *Bron(s)*, a name clearly identical with *Bran*,⁶ the great sea-god of the ancient Welsh.⁷

From these facts two important conclusions may be drawn, namely, (1) the epithet 'rich' denotes a chthonian divinity, a king of the world of the shades; (2) the cult title 'Fisher' applies rather to a sea divinity, patron of fishermen and navigators. How are we to reconcile these apparently contradictory conclusions? The answer is clear: the sea-gods of the ancient Celts were at the same time chthonian divinities, kings of the land of the dead.

Manannan mac Lir, we noted, was a god of fishermen and navigators. What is curious is that this marine divinity has two famous javelins, the Yellow Javelin and the Red Javelin, a sword named the 'Avenger', which never fails him, and two other swords, Great Fury and Little Fury. He is invulnerable, being protected by a magic and impenetrable armour. Even more characteristic is the fact that he is the owner of a cloak which makes him invisible, a feature recalling the *tarnkappe* of the Teutonic dwarfs, clearly inhabitants of the lower world, the helmet of Hades, and the name of that god: *Hades* = *Ἀΐδης*, the 'Invisible'. In a well-known Irish story this cloak separates for ever those between whom it is shaken.⁸ There is furthermore the story of the trip of Cormac mac Art to the dwelling of Manannan to recover his wife and his two children who have fallen into the power of the

¹ B. Schmidt, *Das Volksleben der Neugriechen und das hellenische Altertum*, Leipzig, 1871, p. 135.

² E. Hull, in *Folk-Lore*, xviii (1907), 133; cp. Kuno Meyer, *Archaeological Review*, i (1888), 72 and 152.

³ E. Hübner, 'Das Heiligtum des Nodon', *Bonner Jahrbücher*, 1879, pp. 29-46.

⁴ Cp. *Études celtiques*, iii (1939), 29 ff.

⁵ A. C. L. Brown, in *Kittredge Anniversary*

Papers, Boston, 1913, pp. 235 ff., especially p. 247; cf. also Rhys, *Studies in the Arthurian Legend*, London, 1891, p. 276.

⁶ Newstead, op. cit. pp. 28 ff.

⁷ Cp. *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, cxiv (1936), 244 ff.; *Études celtiques*, loc. cit.

⁸ E. Windisch, *Irische Texte*, i (Leipzig, 1880), 197; A. H. Leahy, *Heroic Romances of Ireland*, i (London, 1905), 57-85.

terrible god of death.¹ *Inis Manannan*, 'the isle of Man', is one of the names of the Irish realm of the dead.²

Manannan is the father of a daughter, the fair Niamh with the Golden Hair, the very one who seduces Oisín, making him leave the world of men. It is well known that he leaped behind her on her fairy horse and that jointly they rode into that mysterious land from whose bourne no traveller returns.³

The Welsh equivalent of Manannan is Manawyddan, king of the shades, a master in the magic arts and, if a Welsh triad is to be believed, the architect of the fortress of Oeth and Anoeth, built with human bones, a sort of dungeon where he would imprison for ever those who happened to drift into his gloomy dwelling. Among his captives was the great King Arthur himself.⁴

Bran, the great Welsh sea-god, is likewise a chthonian, as is shown by his cult title, *bendigeit*, the 'Blessed', which is only a loan translation of Gr. *μάκαρ* (*μάκαρες θεοί*, *μάκαρες οὐράνιοι*, *μάκαρες χθόνιοι*). *Μακάρων νῆσοι* are the Isles of the Blessed, where in the beliefs of the pre-Hellenic populations of Greece the heroes went after death to rest from their labours.⁵

Lastly, there is the Irish Tethra, a sea-god, as was pointed out above. There is however more to him. Several glosses render the word *tethra* by 'crow' (*badhbh*); but *Badhbh* is the name of the sinister goddess of battles, the Irish Bellona. In the texts Tethra is king of the Formori and of the world beyond the grave, described in the pleasing colours of a sort of Elysium. In the *Echtra Condla Chaim*, for example, the inhabitants of this mysterious country, who are expecting anxiously the arrival of the hero, are the 'people of Tethra' and Tethra himself is eager to see him in the assemblies of his friends who had died before him.⁶

The reason for this combination of two functions in the same divine figure is not far to seek: it is connected with the well-known Irish idea that the land of the dead is located at the bottom of the sea or on an island or a continent beyond the Atlantic. It is well to note, however, that this combination of the two functions is by no means peculiar to the Celts: in Greece, too, Poseidon joined to his common functions of a god of the sea those of a divinity of the lower world, as husband of Demeter and father of the Erinyes.⁷ The same holds true for Odysseus, an ancient chthonian and marine divinity, a fact which explains his sea adventures and his descent to the shades.⁸

What distinguishes the Fisher King from these divine and heroic figures is the fact that he is no Olympian enthroned in a sort of paradise, but a poor bewitched and suffering king; the only divine feature he has preserved, namely his immortality, merely adds to his misery. How is this puzzle to be explained? Here again the comparative method will offer us a solution.

¹ H. Zimmer, *Zeitschrift f. deutsches Altertum*, xxxiii (1889), 264 ff.; *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, II, 690; W. Stokes, *Irische Texte*, III, 183 ff.; Chadwick, *The Growth of Literature*, I (Cambridge, 1932), 100; cp. also p. 257.

² Stokes, op. cit. p. 281; *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, II, 689.

³ Squire, op. cit. p. 224; Alexander MacBain, *Celtic Mythology*, Stirling, 1917, p. 142.

⁴ Squire, pp. 217 f., 317.

⁵ Cp. *Études celtiques*, III, 27 ff. I should like to correct here an error committed in that article: *endigeit* is the translation of *μάκαρ*, not of

μακαρίτης; the *μάκαροι* are the dead; *Bendigeit* Vran is thus a dead god, like Osiris, and a king of the dead.

⁶ Windisch, *Kurzgefasste irische Grammatik*, Leipzig, 1879, p. 120; cp. also Hull, loc. cit. pp. 132 ff.

⁷ G. Fougères, *Mantinée et l'Arcadie Orientale*, Paris, 1898, pp. 226 ff. (*Bibl. Ec. Franç. d'Athènes et de Rome*, LXXVIII); L. Malten, *Jahrbuch d. deutschen archäologischen Institute*, xxix (1914), 179-255; Klinz, op. cit. pp. 42 f.

⁸ Fougères, op. cit. pp. 240 ff.; Klinz, pp. 45 f.

In the great Maori creation myth, Raki (=Rangi), god of the sky, assailed by Taka roa, is seriously wounded in the groin. The sequel of the myth and the known variants indicate clearly that we are dealing with a Maori parallel of the ancient Hellenic myth telling of the mutilation of Ouranos by his son Kronos.¹

The myth of Ouranos's fall is by no means the only Greek story of this type. According to a rather ancient tradition, Heracles is wounded in the κοτύλη by Hippocoon, a chthonian of the pre-Dorian population of Laconia.² The same thing happened to Castor in his duel with Aphidnos (=the 'Ruthless'), another form of the sinister king of the shades.³ There is, further, the story of Adonis similarly wounded by a wild boar.⁴ To the same type belongs the myth of Iphiclos, rendered sterile by witchcraft and cured by Melampus. Now it is to be noted that Iphiclos, like Admetos, is the owner of large herds, which Melampus tried to lift, though unsuccessfully: he was captured himself and recovered his freedom only after curing his captor. The situation is thus the following: Iphiclos, a heroic form of the king of the shades, the owner of vast herds watched by a dog which no one dares approach (evidently a mere double of Cerberos), suffers from sterility as a result of a spell, from which he is cured by Melampus.⁵

In Egypt, the great chthonian divinity is Osiris, of whom the story went that he had been a mortal king slain by his twin brother who, not content with this foul murder, mutilated and cut up the corpse of his victim. The wife of Osiris, his faithful Isis, then collected the *disiecta membra* of the slain, excepting one, his phallus. Osiris, who after his death became king of the lower world, is thus a mutilated king, very much like the Fisher King.

Apparently of Anatolian origin is the myth of Zeus overcome by Typhon and reduced to a state of extreme impotence, from which he is freed by Hermes, who enters the cave into which the great Olympian had been cast and renders him his virile powers.

In other stories the god is thought to have been plunged into a magic sleep, for example in a Phrygian tradition recorded by Plutarch.⁶ Sometimes he is imagined to lie imprisoned during the winter season and to be freed with the coming of spring.⁷

The divine figure stricken with sterility is not necessarily a god. Sometimes it is a goddess. Suffice it to recall the Babylonian story of Ištar, who passes part of the year in the lower world, which leads to general sterility. Much the same situation exists in Greece during the period of Demeter's mourning, threatening with famine mankind and even the beasts in the field.

It is clear that in all these myths we are dealing with as many attempts to explain the alternation of the seasons in the temperate zones. During winter the god is stricken with sterility, imprisoned, plunged into a magic sleep, in one word, impotent. With the coming of spring he is freed from his dungeon and recovers his virile powers after breaking the spell.

This conclusion is not altogether new. Even before the first world war Miss Weston pointed out that the wound of the Fisher King is really a euphemism. It is,

¹ E. Stucken, *Astralmythen*, iv (Leipzig, 1896-1907), 219 f.

² Sam Wide, *Lakonische Kulte*, Leipzig, 1893, pp. 187 and 322.

³ Cp. *Rheinisches Museum f. Philologie*, LXXX (1931), 124.

⁴ Charles Vellay, *Le culte et les fêtes d'Adonis-Thammouz dans l'Orient antique*, Paris, 1904, pp. 93 f.

⁵ Cp. H. D. Müller, *Mythologie der griechischen Stämme*, I (Göttingen, 1857-61), 175 ff.; Pauly-Wissowa, *R.-E.* XXIX, col. 394 f.

⁶ *De Is. et Os.* c. 69.

⁷ *Ibid.*; cp. also R. Much in *Abhandlungen zur germanischen Philologie*, Festgabe f. Richard Heintel, Halle, 1898, p. 267.

however, well to observe that even a literal interpretation of these texts would not contradict this conclusion. The Australian aborigines, after slaying an enemy, cut off a piece of skin from his loins, since the loins, in their view, are the seat of life. Again, the Hebrews currently employ the word *bāṣen* 'loins' to designate the seat of man's generative power;¹ hence the peculiar sanctity of the *nervus ischiadicus* in the Hebrew religion.²

To sum up: The Fisher King is a heroic form of an ancient Celtic god who, like the Hellenic Poseidon, joined the functions of a god of the sea to those of a chthonian divinity. This explains the close relations of the Grail Castle with the sea on the one hand, the epithet 'rich' and the wound of the Fisher King on the other. The myth of this wound and its cure is an aetiological story explaining the alternation of the seasons, the god being stricken with sterility in the autumn, to lie spell-bound during the winter, and to be redeemed with the coming of summer. It is quite probable, as Miss Weston pointed out some thirty years ago, that the *Conte du Graal* is based upon a rite: most myths of this type have grown out of rites. But this would certainly not invalidate our conclusions; it would rather go far to confirm them.

ALEXANDER H. KRAPPE

PRINCETON, N.J.

¹ W. Robertson Smith, *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*, Cambridge, 1885, p. 34.

² Gen. xxxii, 32.

AN OPTIMISTIC STREAK IN VOLTAIRE'S THOUGHT

The evolution which took place in Voltaire's¹ attitude towards the problem of evil is well known. It is generally agreed that his final position was that of a meliorist. Certain scholars have, however, disagreed with this judgement, and Voltaire has been claimed as both a pessimist and an optimist. The purpose of the present article is not to pass the whole question once again in review, but, while accepting the general verdict on Voltaire's ultimate position, to indicate the existence in his thought of a persistent and distinctly non-rational tendency towards optimism, which reveals itself even in the midst of his most pessimistic reflexions. So great is his desire to avoid a completely pessimistic conclusion, that he frequently shrinks from pushing his own arguments to their logical end, and adopts a line of reasoning which in other circumstances he does not hesitate to reject. There is thus a dual line of thought, one rational, the other non-rational. His experience of the world obliges him to abandon his former optimism, but it is with reluctance that he sees himself driven so far along the road of pessimism, and he seems instinctively to seek any issue which avoids complete despair. One is reminded of Voltaire's own confession, in his letters, of the reluctance with which he underwent a parallel conversion: 'J'avais grande envie que nous fussions libres; j'ai fait tout ce que j'ai pu pour le croire. L'expérience et la raison me convainquent que nous sommes des machines faites pour aller un certain temps, et comme il plaît à Dieu.'²

Before passing on to consider the various manifestations of Voltaire's optimistic streak during the period of his 'pessimism', it is worth glancing for a moment at the basis of his original optimism. Even here rationalization seems to be already at work. Until almost the middle of the century Voltaire remains a professed Leibnizian, and it is true that he frequently makes use of orthodox Leibnizian arguments. In his *Philosophie de Newton*, for example, the problem of evil is treated entirely from the universal standpoint. There is however a good deal of evidence to show that Voltaire's optimism is based in reality not upon the convinced acceptance of a comprehensive philosophical system, but upon an instinctively optimistic outlook, reinforced by the complacency bred of his own comfortable situation. The true foundation of his optimism is to be sought in the *Mondain*; the Leibnizian arguments he uses are at bottom no more than a convenient rationalization and an impressive endorsement of his naturally optimistic view of life. It is because he is already an optimist that he accepts the doctrine of Leibniz and Pope; his attitude is not in the first place determined by any profound conviction of its truth. As soon as his optimistic outlook on human existence is lost, he rejects the Leibnizian system in its entirety. Clearly, therefore, Voltaire's optimism is never a real philosophic optimism; he is an optimist only in the vulgar sense of the term, and his acceptance of a complete optimistic system of philosophy is purely passive. It is a relic of this natural optimism which later recurs and, pitting itself against the lessons of reason and experience, exercises a strange non-rational influence upon Voltaire during the period of his 'pessimism'.

Voltaire's conversion from the optimistic faith begins towards the end of the Versailles period of his life. The famous *Poème sur le Désastre de Lisbonne* is the first great manifestation of his new outlook. Few of Voltaire's works have been so

¹ All references to Voltaire's works are to the Moland edition, in 52 vols., Paris, 1877-83.

² Quoted by A. Morize in his critical edition of *Candide*, Paris, 1913.

much discussed or received such a variety of interpretations. Two widely different views of the poem are of immediate interest. Lord Morley¹ regards it as an expression of utter pessimism and despair. Mr Alfred Noyes,² on the other hand, considers that, apart from questions of dogma, the philosophy contained in the poem is not so very far removed from that of Christendom. If this is indeed so, it must be fundamentally optimistic.

That such a wide divergence of opinion can exist is scarcely surprising, for the poem provides one of the most striking examples of the influence which Voltaire's innate tendency towards optimism is able to exercise even in the midst of deeply pessimistic reflexions. Voltaire launches a violent attack on the 'Tout est bien' philosophy. He rejects with scorn the entire system of universal optimism, and restores the problem of evil to a thoroughly human basis. The whole poem seems plunged in the deepest gloom. Voltaire insists on the reality of evil, and on the utter misery of the human state; the surrounding darkness is evidently impenetrable, for

Quelque parti qu'on prenne, on doit frémir, sans doute,
Il n'est rien qu'on connaisse, et rien qu'on ne redoute.

It was these two lines especially which led Lord Morley to interpret the poem in the most pessimistic sense possible. According to him, Voltaire wishes to show that on all sides there is nothing but disillusion and despair. And yet Voltaire does not end on this pessimistic note; he manages to find a glimmer of brightness somewhere. He recommends to mankind the hope of immortality:

Un jour tout sera bien, voilà notre espérance,
Tout est bien aujourd'hui, voilà l'illusion.

It is worthy of note that Voltaire himself implies that this hope of a life to come is the only bulwark against complete despair:

Le présent est affreux, s'il n'est point d'avenir,
Si la nuit du tombeau détruit l'être qui pense.

As Mr Noyes points out, the hope of immortality is not the only 'Christian' idea in the poem. Voltaire refuses, despite the formidable tale of evil, to renounce his faith in the goodness and justice of God. He then argues that since God is just, there must be some solution to the problem of evil—all will be well in the end, all must be well, if not in this life, perhaps in a life to come. The two 'Christian' ideas interlock, and together they constitute a quite definitely optimistic creed. It is on this conclusion that Mr Noyes's interpretation is founded. But it would not be right to regard the poem as optimistic. A closer examination reveals that it contains two distinct lines of reasoning. Those arguments which lead Voltaire towards complete despair are arguments which he employs continually, and which are based on his own experience, whereas those which permit him at the last moment to avoid a pessimistic conclusion are not only of the *a priori* type which he usually despises, but are arguments which elsewhere he specifically rejects. He admits that the hope of immortality is his one defence against complete pessimism, yet elsewhere, whenever he discusses the possibility of survival after death, he shows himself entirely sceptical.³ Lord Morley may not therefore be far wrong. Voltaire can see nothing on all sides but despair, to such an extent that in order to escape utter pessimism he is obliged to resort to an argument in which

¹ J. Morley, *Voltaire* (1872), p. 268.

² A. Noyes, *Voltaire* (1936), pp. 462 ff.

³ Cf. *Lettres Philosophiques* (Letter on Locke),

Traité de Métaphysique (chap. vi), *Dictionnaire Philosophique* (art. 'Âme').

he has no real faith. That he does so is however ample proof of his desire to achieve a less gloomy outlook. So great is this desire that it turns him aside from the logical conclusion of his own arguments and sets him on the path of rationalization.

It is interesting to note that on one other occasion Voltaire makes a similar use of the doctrine of immortality. In the *Homélie sur l'Athéisme*¹ he once again suggests immortality as the only possible solution to the problem of evil, and he goes so far as to support his suggestion by an appeal to the argument from universal consent, which, in common with all philosophers since Bayle, he usually treats with complete contempt. In order to preserve some avenue of hope, he is apparently prepared, when cornered, to deny established principles of his own thought.

It may be objected that Voltaire's final position, in both of the above instances, is determined not by any innate tendency towards optimism, but by that faith in Divine justice and goodness which he persistently refuses to abandon. As Voltaire himself asserts in the article 'Théiste' in his *Dictionnaire Philosophique*, the difficulties arising from the problem of evil, great though they may be, cannot shake his faith. But is it unreasonable to regard this faith as being itself a further manifestation of the same optimistic tendency? Once again there is a double line of thought. Voltaire, it is true, gives frequent expression to his belief in the justice of God, and yet the idea of Divine justice is in reality no better founded in his reasoning than the hope of immortality. The arguments he advances in support of his belief are both few and flimsy. He makes great use of the argument from final causes, which however, as he himself admits, can prove nothing more than the existence and the intelligence of God. In general he admits, and indeed stresses, the impossibility of knowing the Divine attributes.² When therefore he attempts to find a rational basis for his faith in Divine justice, he is reduced to declaring that God must be just, because anything else would be unthinkable. It would be 'horrible' to admit that God could be anything but just; 'il vaudrait mieux s'en tenir à la nécessité fatale des choses'.³ Once again, Voltaire's desire to take the optimistic view is very much in evidence, and it pushes him beyond the bounds of what he would normally consider sound argument. Whenever he tries conscientiously to define his conception of God he is on the verge of pantheism. And, strikingly enough, it is that very 'nécessité fatale' which he condemns which is Voltaire's last word on the subject when he considers the problem of evil in the light of his determinist principles.⁴ He arrives at the conception of universal necessity. All that exists, exists necessarily, inevitably. This dominant principle of necessity can know neither good nor evil, and is responsible for both. Since God too is subject to the laws of necessity, the question of his justice becomes irrelevant, as he is no longer supreme. In effect, the question is decided in a pessimistic sense, since the supreme power is not an active force for good or against evil. Voltaire however does not go beyond the mere idea of necessity, and makes no attempt to apply its conclusions to his conception of a good and just Divinity. He allows the dualism to remain, and frequently asserts, as before, the goodness and justice of God. As in the *Poème*, there are two lines of thought, one founded on experience and closely reasoned argument, the other founded on an instinctive optimism, supported by some attempt at rationalization, and allowing Voltaire to escape the pessimistic conclusion of the prior line of thought.

¹ *Homélie sur l'Athéisme*, 1767 (ed. Moland, xxvi, 318 ff.).

² Cf. *Traité de Métaphysique*, chap 2, and *Homélie sur l'Athéisme* (ed. Moland, xxvi, 318).

³ *Homélie sur l'Athéisme* (ed. Moland, xxvi, 319 ff.).

⁴ *Tout en Dieu* (ed. Moland, xxviii, pp. 97 ff.).

Even in his evaluation of human life, whose miseries he never fails to stress, Voltaire reveals a similar reluctance to take a completely pessimistic view. Nowhere is this reluctance more visible than in his extremely interesting correspondence with Madame du Deffand.¹ The Marquise, herself profoundly sceptical and pessimistic, makes good use of certain of Voltaire's own arguments, and she succeeds in driving him into a most uncomfortable position. He is obliged to admit most of her contentions, but though hard pressed he goes to great lengths in order to evade her despairing conclusions. He agrees that since man's life is so unhappy, 'le néant est, généralement parlant, préférable à la vie',² but he rejects Madame du Deffand's suggestion that suicide is therefore the logical course. There is always, he says, some consolation which makes life bearable. The consolations which Voltaire recommends in answer to her constant complaints vary, however, from letter to letter. He offers a fairly wide selection—friendship, philosophy, epicureanism, stoicism, etc.—but he is sometimes reduced to dire straits, as when he can do no better than suggest that we should be 'heureux de tous les maux qui ne nous arrivent pas'.³ It is clear that Voltaire is sometimes conscious of the wishful nature of his efforts to find some hopeful issue. Thus he writes to the Marquise: 'Vous voyez, madame, que je me bats les flancs pour trouver la façon d'être le moins malheureux qu'il me soit possible; car pour le mot d'heureux, il ne me paraît guère fait que pour les romans'.⁴ Voltaire offers a similar variety of 'consolations' or 'refuges' to all his friends. The truth is that although his experience and his reason lend a profoundly pessimistic colouring to his view of human existence, his personal optimism, in the popular sense of the term, is irrepressible, and forbids him to despair entirely of a life which he cannot but find rather enjoyable.

It is clear that Voltaire's suggestion of immortality, his insistence on Divine goodness and justice, and his embarrassed searching for 'refuges' and 'consolations', are all manifestations of an instinctive, non-rational refusal to accept the pessimistic point of view which his own reason thrusts upon him. There are two lines of thought throughout. As far as the metaphysical problem of evil is concerned, it is difficult to regard his ultimate position as anything but pessimistic. The theories of universal necessity to which he is driven have a secure basis in his thought. The conflicting belief in a just and all-powerful God, to which he still clings as a refuge against pessimism, is on the other hand in contradiction to his general line of reasoning. He never fully confronts the two opposing views, and the dualism remains. On a less exalted plane, however, Voltaire is successful in finding a perfectly rational, well-founded defence against pessimism. His belief in the possibility and the benefits of material progress is a fundamental part of his philosophy of history, and it permits him to view human life and effort with a certain degree of optimism. It is this positivist attitude, rather than any ill-based but expedient metaphysical optimism, which forms Voltaire's true barrier against the despair he so keenly wishes to avoid.

K. ROCKETT

BRADFORD

¹ Voltaire's correspondence with the unhappy marquise, never very cheerful, becomes even less so towards the middle of 1764, when he discusses the problem of evil with her.

² à Madame du Deffand, 24 mai 1764 (ed. Moland, XLIII, 222).

³ à Madame du Deffand, 30 octobre 1764 (ed. Moland, XLIII, 334).

⁴ à la même, 3 octobre 1764 (ed. Moland, XLIII, 334).

PROUST AND RUSKIN: RECONSIDERED IN THE LIGHT OF 'LETTRES À UNE AMIE'

Readers of Proust will be grateful to Madame Riefstahl for publishing the forty-one letters she has preserved of those she received from him between the years 1899¹ and 1908.² Among the reasons for welcoming this beautifully printed little book, one, immediately obvious, is the delight of handling so pleasant an example of the book-maker's art in days when war-time restrictions impose a paper, type and binding that are enough to deter all but the hardened reader. Madame Riefstahl has been fortunate in her publisher, M. César Sfeir; had these letters appeared in a form less fitting, Ruskin and Proust would surely have met in the shades to lament the backsliding of an artist and craftswoman, disciple of the one and friend of the other, and an active link between them.

Madame Riefstahl, Marie Nordlinger as she then was, first met Proust in Paris, one evening in December 1896, at the house of her aunt, the mother of Reynaldo Hahn. If it be not ungracious, one would wish that 'la jeune cousine de Manchester' had given more precise and personal form to her recollections of the rather exquisite little circle into which she was admitted. Her account in the preface to this volume vouchsafes only a bare glimpse of one or two of its members and their doings—Frédéric de Madrazo, her cousin Reynaldo at the piano or excitedly defending classic art and Mozart against Proust's Gothic and Wagner, excursions to the Louvre to check what Edmond de Goncourt had said the night before at the Daudets' about some artist of the eighteenth century, those famous Tuesday gatherings at Madeleine Lemaire's of which Proust has left so vivid an evocation in *La Cour aux lilas et l'atelier des Roses*.³ These things are just mentioned, and, when she speaks more fully of Proust and the experiences she shared with him, Madame Riefstahl makes extensive quotation from Proust's own published writings.⁴ It is not, perhaps, what we hoped to find—the experience itself, or, if transmuted, then by a memory of another sort than his. To remark on this is only to encourage Madame Riefstahl to delve more confidently into her own store of recollections, to save what she can and while she can from that charmed Paris life, as it now seems to us, before the storm broke.

The letters themselves deal mainly with Proust's reading of Ruskin and the revelation of Gothic architecture which he found in the master's writings and shared with his equally enthusiastic young correspondent. The lapse of years, as this article will show, brought a change in Proust's attitude, greater, one suspects, than in that of Madame Riefstahl. But the second letter, of 5 December 1899, already speaks of him:

¹ The undated first letter was clearly written early in the new year following the operation on his mother, which Madame Riefstahl's note (p. 113) wrongly dates in July 1896. It was, in fact, 1898: cf. Proust's letter to Robert Dreyfus of 9 Nov. 1898, given in Dreyfus, *Souvenirs sur Marcel Proust*, pp. 155–6.

² Marcel Proust, *Lettres à une amie*, recueil de quarante-et-une lettres inédites adressées à Marie Nordlinger 1899–1908, Editions du Calame, Manchester, 1942.

³ *Chroniques*, pp. 28–38.

⁴ More extensive than is always indicated: e.g. one would have welcomed an independent version of Proust's eloquent account of how he first read Ruskin's famous passage on the decadence of Venice in Saint Mark's, 'pendant une heure d'orage et d'obscurité' (*Pastiches et Mélanges*, 'John Ruskin', p. 185); but Madame Riefstahl (*Au Lecteur*, p. ix) merely repeats his phrases.

Depuis une quinzaine de jours, je m'occupe à un petit travail absolument différent de ce que je fais généralement, à propos de Ruskin et de certaines cathédrales;¹

and the fortieth, of 13 April 1907, expresses his thanks for her New Year's gift of an 'admirable calendrier qui ne me quitte pas':

J'effeuille la poétique sagesse des jours en vous remerciant toujours, en même temps que Ruskin, de la pensée que chaque feuillet m'apporte.

Ruskin, then, is the main theme of this handful of letters; if not their only one, at least their *leit-motiv*. And on that score, the student of Proust's mind and art must regret, however much he may understand, the delicacy that made Mlle Nordlinger destroy the letters he wrote to her at the time of his mother's death in 1905. 'Il y dévoilait sa blessure avec un abandon si complet', she tells us in her preface, 'que je me fis un devoir de les soustraire aux regards indifférents.' To regret that decision is not merely to ask the general question how far a writer of Proust's magnitude loses the privileges of privacy granted to ordinary mortals, or whether, now that her friend's life has come into the 'domaine publique', Madame Riefstahl would endorse the action of Marie Nordlinger. In 1905 it was a natural and a delicate one; and even she, with her conviction of his future greatness, could not foresee how illuminating those particular letters would have been, if, as her words and action suggest, they conveyed, in its first, uncontrolled 'abandon', the suffering that left its poignant, reawakened pain in the account of the death of the grandmother in the wonderful opening chapter of the second volume of *Le Côté de Guermantes*. The destroyed letters, we may guess, would, for this central experience of Proust's life and work, have restored to us the very essence of 'le Temps perdu', before its transmutation by memory and the writer's art. As it is, we must accept their loss, and seek the interest of those which remain.

They belong, it is clear, to a period of literary incubation, the period covering the growth and decline of Proust's admiration for Ruskin.² On that phase of his intellectual history, and on the translations in which it found vent, these letters throw fresh light. Mlle Nordlinger and Proust met at the moment when he received the full impact of Ruskin's gospel, and his interest must have been immeasurably quickened by the unexpected appearance in his own intimate circle of this young English girl, fluent in Ruskin's unfamiliar tongue, an adept in his teaching, herself an artist of skill and distinction in a handicraft such as Ruskin delighted to praise.

The Ruskin strain in his letters to her is of varying kinds. Least important, though very considerable in quantity, are references to difficulties encountered in his translations,³ in which she came to act almost as collaborator. When Ruskin died in January 1900, Proust had by him his own version of many passages from which he proposed to quote at large in various articles.⁴ He therefore thought at

¹ Mme Riefstahl (note, p. 114) comments: 'Pèlerinages Ruskiniens, publiés l'année suivante dans le *Figaro* (13 février 1900). Ce travail servit plus tard de préface à la *Bible d'Amiens*.' Mme Riefstahl appears to have confused *Pèlerinages Ruskiniens* with *Journées de pèlerinage*, which was published in the *Mercure de France*, April 1900, and was later incorporated into the Préface to the *Bible d'Amiens*.

² For the influence of Ruskin on Proust, see two articles by Dr Jessie Murray in the *Mercure de France*, 1926, and the *Nineteenth Century*, 1927; A. J. Roche, 'Proust as a translator of Ruskin', *P.M.L.A.* 1930; and A. Maurois,

'Proust et Ruskin', in *Essays and Studies of the English Association*, vol. xvii, 1931.

³ 'La Bible d'Amiens', *Mercure de France*, 1904; 'Sésame et les Lys', *Mercure de France*, 1906. The *Bible* is prefaced by *Journées de pèlerinage* and *Sésame* by *Journées de lecture*, both reprinted in *Pastiches et Mélanges*, pp. 100-47 and 225-72.

⁴ Thus overcoming Ruskin's objection to a French translation of his works, cf. *Lettres à une amie*, p. 11. He quotes extensively in the two articles in the *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, xxiii, 310-19; xxiv, 135-47, subsequently reprinted in *Pastiches et Mélanges*, 'John Ruskin', pp. 148-97.

once of his English friend as a competent guide to the intricacies of the English language; and at a later stage, in the years 1903 to 1905 when he was busy on the final form of his translations of the *Bible* and *Sesame*, some thirty of these letters were written, full of acknowledgements of explanations and appeals for further help. Mlle Nordlinger's share was no easy one. There were points of English grammar and vocabulary to elucidate, *nuances* of Ruskin's style to define, circumstantial tales of missing *cahiers* and pages of precious notes gone astray, and always, as Proust remarked with a certain grim amusement, the words, 'J'ai été si malade, je suis encore si malade', running discordantly through all their relations, even by letter. His knowledge of English was scanty and at best insecure: 'moi qui sais si mal les langues', he cries in another connexion.¹ One is left wondering how much he ever understood when he puzzles over this simple point of English syntax: 'Herod's driving out the Madonna into Egypt... ce génitif *Herod's* dépend de quel substantif, le *quoi* d'Hérode?'² Or, again, we see how unexpectedly a word might find him unaware of its exact shade of meaning or even totally at fault, when he asks: '*significant* of *Thuringian armouries*. *Significant* veut dire rappelant, n'est-ce pas? Mais *armouries* n'est dans aucun dictionnaire. Est-ce armoiries? ou armure? (le sens me paraît plutôt armoiries).'³ And yet again: '*careless writing*. J'ai remplacé "entretien fortuit" par "dans le négligé de la causerie".'⁴ If things like these gave him pause, and more than pause, how much worse when there was some Ruskinian complication, however slight, of thought or phrase:

Ruskin dit: 'I believe the idea of the designer was that *virtually*... the Queen Mary *visited* Herod when she sent, or *had sent* for her, the Magi to tell him of her presence at Bethléem'... Passe encore pour *virtually*, mais *visited*? Cela veut-il dire *visitait* Hérode? Ou bien éprouvait Hérode, mettait Hérode à l'épreuve?... Ou '*visited*' veut-il dire qu'elle était *venue pour visiter* Hérode,... qu'elle avait une intention de visite?⁵

Translation on these terms must have been a painful business, and we are not surprised to find Proust leaning heavily on Mlle Nordlinger:

Je vous envoie ce que j'ai trouvé de *Sesame*... Les mots soulignés sont ceux qui m'ont paru douteux; les mots laissés en blanc, ceux incompris. Soulignez vous-même avec un crayon spécial tous les contre-sens, en écrivant au-dessus, dans la ligne laissée en blanc... le vrai sens... Pour les nuances, nous verrons après.⁶

There was one inevitable result. 'J'ai refait le commencement, *changeant chaque mot*', he wails despairingly, 'mais j'en ai fait au plus dix pages... si j'y mets tant de scrupules, il nous faudra dix ans.'⁷ But Mlle Nordlinger's English *expertise* brought a subtler complication in its train. She spoke and wrote French, he told her affectionately,

non seulement mieux qu'une Française, mais comme une Française. Mais quand vous traduisez l'anglais, toute la nature primitive reparaît: les mots retournent à leur genre, à leurs affinités, à leur sens, à leurs règles natales. Et quelque charme qu'il y ait à ce déguisement anglais de mots français... il faudra refroidir toute cette vie, franciser, éloigner encore de l'original et éteindre l'originalité.

Her 'belle traduction' he is therefore going to examine closely, 'et, si vous permettez, changer, mais timidement, avec un affectueux respect. Mais changer

¹ *Lettres à une amie*, p. 28. Cf. also *Correspondance générale*, iii, 13: '...je lis l'anglais très difficilement.' M. Proust to Mme S. Schiff [undated circa 1919].

² *Ibid.* p. 57.

³ *Ibid.* p. 58.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 42. It is true that he was dissatisfied with his phrase.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 56. The italics are Proust's.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 65.

⁷ *Ibid.* pp. 39-40.

cependant'.¹ Clearly the deciding word lay with Proust, his and his only was the final responsibility for the translations of Ruskin.² Not all Mlle Nordlinger's careful corrections could prevent misinterpretations of the English, and his circumlocutions, often laboured, over-scrupulous, did the rest. Few will dissent from Mr Roche's judgement that 'on the whole' Proust 'translates poorly'.³ The *Lettres à une amie* tell us why.

The secrets of the translator's workshop make a large and in its way an interesting part of this newly published volume. But Proust's translations have to be looked at in a just proportion, related both to the influence of Ruskin on him and to the larger matter of his own characteristic vision and art. Here and there in the letters to Mlle Nordlinger we catch a promise of the fuller growth or a hint that finds its confirmation in the later, more considered writings. It may be accidental, but it squares with other evidence, that the most eloquent expression of admiration for Ruskin occurs in an early letter—it is true that it was called forth by his death:

Je sais combien que c'est peu que la mort en voyant combien vit avec force ce mort, combien je l'admire, l'écoute, cherche à le comprendre et lui obéir plus qu'à bien des vivants.⁴

A month or so later he names several of Ruskin's books that he knows 'par cœur', and will be grateful for anything else he has written about the French cathedrals: 'si, dans dix ans, une ligne de lui là-dessus vous tombe sous la main, cela m'intéressera autant qu'aujourd'hui'.⁵ He little foresaw that in much less than half that time he would be snatching at the chance of translating a mere six-page preface to *Sesame and Lilies* instead of the fuller version running to thirty,⁶ and even confessing to the still enthusiastic Mlle Nordlinger, 'Ce vieillard commence à m'ennuyer'.⁷

Much of that may merely be the weariness of the translator. But in the interval his enthusiasm had receded from its highest level, his concern with Ruskin taken another form and direction. The visit to Venice in the May of 1900 marks a turning-point. It would be inexact to say creates it, though it is worth noting that it was in Saint Mark's that he first read the eloquent passage on the decadence of Venice which became the text for his analysis of the insincerity—of what he calls the 'idolâtrie'—in Ruskin's thought.⁸ But it is in the same context that Proust develops most explicitly the exact nature of his discipleship, his willingness, in spite of all his reservations about Ruskin's theories and mode of thinking, to undergo the 'discipline' of seeing the beauties that Ruskin had seen, through the eyes of the master. To those 'personnes médiocres' who object: 'Que peut vous importer ce que sent Ruskin: sentez par vous-même', he has the unanswerable and wholly characteristic reply:

Aussi cette servitude volontaire est-elle le commencement de la liberté. Il n'y a pas de meilleure manière d'arriver à prendre conscience de ce qu'on sent soi-même que d'essayer de recréer en soi ce qu'a senti un maître.⁹

Ruskin was then, and remained, for Proust such a 'maître', 'un des plus grands écrivains de tous les temps et de tous les pays'.¹⁰

¹ Ibid. pp. 45-7.

² Again: 'Il vaut mieux que je révise seul ce que vous avez fait', *ibid.* p. 48.

³ A. J. Roche, *op. cit.* A large part of the article examines mistakes and infelicities in the translation of the first lecture of *Sesame and Lilies*.

⁴ *Lettres à une amie*, p. 9.

⁵ Ibid. p. 15.

⁶ In a letter of 27 May 1904, *ibid.* pp. 63-4.

⁷ Ibid. p. 58.

⁸ *Pastiches et Mélanges*, 'John Ruskin', pp. 184-93.

⁹ Ibid. pp. 195-6.

¹⁰ Ibid. p. 187.

It was in this spirit of ardent submission that Proust set out for Venice, the strong conviction that Death, which had overtaken Ruskin, was at hand for him also giving a sharpened urgency to his desire to impress on his own senses the beauty that Ruskin had seen and revealed.¹ 'Si vous alliez à Venise', he wrote to Mlle Nordlinger, then in Florence, 'prévenez-moi, car il est possible... que j'y aille.'² Proust and his mother joined her there.³ *Stones of Venice* in hand, they visited Saint Mark's together; together, she tells us, in its shadow they corrected the proofs of their translation of *The Bible of Amiens*,⁴ together they looked at the originals of descriptions that both knew by heart, Proust eagerly trying to see and feel everywhere the beauty that Ruskin had seen and felt as Ruskin had seen and felt it. This is the experience recorded in a few lines of the *John Ruskin* published⁵ on his return from Italy, and developed at length in the chapter entitled *Séjour à Venise* in *Albertine disparue*.⁶ Only four years later, this most subtle and impassioned of all the explorers of the world of human memory in our time is found exclaiming:

Vous avez une mémoire inouïe. Moi qui, à cause de ces horribles médicaments antiasthmatiques, ne me rappelle rien de la veille, je vous envie de garder des jours de Venise un souvenir si précis.⁷

Madame Riefstahl alone can now tell us what Proust said, what was his direct response at that enchanted moment, can help us to recapture the precious element of *fact*, present and immediate, in 'le Temps perdu'.

At that point in the consideration of these letters, two questions emerge, apparently distinct, and yet allied. What is the place of the translations in Proust's discipleship to Ruskin, what the meaning of those laborious years in the story of his development? And secondly, how much do the Nordlinger letters reveal of the genesis of his own technique? The answers will be found to converge.

These two problems must be related firmly to the context of all that we know from other sources of Proust's mind and its working, if we are not to exaggerate the importance of the particular range of his experience recorded in these letters. First, then, how are we to explain the queer paradox that the years of systematic work on the translations came at the end of the Ruskin 'phase', after the most complete discipleship was over? Proust himself gives a categorical statement of this sequence in a letter to Léon Bélugou in 1906:

Oui, mon amour pour Ruskin dure. Seulement quelquefois rien ne le refroidit comme de lire Ruskin. Hélas, cher Monsieur, pour vous la rendre, cette ferveur, il faudrait que je l'eusse gardée. Et déjà quand je traduais la *Bible d'Amiens*, j'avouais... que je l'avais perdue. En tout cas, pour *Sésame*, je n'en eus jamais, c'est à mon avis le plus mauvais ouvrage de Ruskin. Mais bien souvent dans les autres... de mes feux mal éteints je reconnais la trace' et, si j'y mettais seulement un peu d'insincérité, je pourrais m'enflammer entièrement. Mais mon premier amour fut plus involontaire.⁸

Still more pointed is the confession to a friend at much the same date: 'Ruskin m'a un peu intoxiqué.'⁹ It is a common enough experience. Proust's admiration for Ruskin, and for Gothic art as he interpreted it, was ardent and perfectly

¹ Ibid. p. 194. In much the same spirit and the same terms he writes of the need to complete his great work before he dies, in the closing pages of *Le Temps perdu*.

² Ibid. p. 21.

³ She was accompanied by an aunt and Reynaldo Hahn.

⁴ *Lettres à une amie*, p. ix.

⁵ In the *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, 1900.

⁶ Chapter III.

⁷ *Lettres à une amie*, p. 54.

⁸ Quoted in E. de Clermont-Tonnerre, *Robert de Montesquiou et Marcel Proust*, pp. 148-9.

⁹ Léon Pierre-Quint, *Marcel Proust, sa vie et son Œuvre*, p. 43.

genuine. But there was a strain of deferred and rather chaste Romanticism in it and in the eagerness of his acceptance of the Ruskin revelation that he outgrew. And there, one might think, would have been an end to it. Why, then, did he persist in laborious translation that was, in some considerable part, against the grain?

Writing to Mlle Nordlinger in December 1906, just after the publication of his *Sésame*, Proust suggests two reasons:

J'ai clos à jamais l'ère des traductions, que maman favorisait. Et quant aux traductions de moi-même, je n'en ai plus le courage.¹

His mother's encouragement,² and the detail of translation as a mere intellectual substitute for the creative work for which he lacked both the strength and, in his own word, the 'courage'—either or both of these might seem a sufficient explanation. But there is another, which carries us deeper into the working of Proust's mind. It is implicit in this passage of his *John Ruskin*:

C'est quand Ruskin est bien loin de nous que nous traduisons ses livres et tâchons de fixer dans une image ressemblante les traits de sa pensée. Aussi ne connaîtrez-vous pas les accents de notre foi ou de notre amour, et c'est notre piété seule que vous apercevrez çà et là, froide et furtive, occupée, comme la Vierge Thébaine, à restaurer un tombeau.³

Those words read extraordinarily like an adumbration, an early draft of the characteristic process of his mind; and at that point it becomes important to see what evidence there is that this was already taking shape. For, after all, and though Madame Riefstahl might not agree, the only importance of all this Ruskin business to us now is its part in the formation of Proust's aim in *A la Recherche du Temps perdu*.

The *Lettres à une amie* fortunately supply the evidence. In a letter of 5 December 1899, he writes:

Je travaille depuis longtemps à un ouvrage de très longue haleine, mais sans rien achever. Et il y a des moments où je me demande si je ne ressemble pas au mari de Dorothea Brook dans *Middlemarch*⁴ et si je n'amasse pas des ruines.

Depuis une quinzaine de jours, je m'occupe à un petit travail⁵ absolument différent de ce que je fais généralement, à propos de Ruskin et de certaines cathédrales.⁶

The juxtaposition, as we have seen, may be significant. It may have been the feeling of uncertainty and discouragement over his own work that made Proust lay it aside and devote himself for the next six years to the Ruskin translations, which, in spite of his rudimentary knowledge of English, did not require the same concentration or the same intensely personal documentation. But it is much more important that here he reveals plainly that he had already dimly conceived, and begun sketching, his great book *before* the Ruskin writings. And this takes on added importance when, in a still earlier letter, we find a strong foreshadowing of the conception of the continuity of time that he made his own, a fond brooding on those incidental associations, those little concrete things that make the past live again, in all of us but in none more than in Proust, in an eternally renewed and different present. This earlier letter is the first of the series, written about the New Year of 1899, and this is its central theme:

Si nous n'étions que des êtres de raison, nous ne croirions pas aux anniversaires, aux fêtes, aux reliques, aux tombeaux. Mais comme nous sommes faits aussi d'un peu de

¹ *Lettres à une amie*, p. 105.

² Elsewhere recorded.

³ *Pastiches et Mélanges*, 'John Ruskin', p. 197.

⁴ A favourite book to which he refers again in a later letter, *Lettres à une amie*, p. 50.

⁵ See ante, p. 29, note 1.

⁶ *Lettres à une amie*, pp. 5-6.

matière, nous aimons à croire qu'elle est quelque chose aussi dans la réalité... qu'elle a, comme notre âme l'a en notre corps, son symbole matériel. Et puis, au fur et à mesure que Noël perd pour nous de sa vérité comme anniversaire, par la douce émanation des souvenirs accumulés, il prend une réalité de plus en plus vive, où la lumière de ses bougies, le mélancolique obstacle de ses neiges à quelque venue désirée, l'odeur de ses mandarines imbibant la chaleur de ses chambres, la gaité de ses froids et de ses feux, les parfums du thé et des mimosas nous réapparaissent enduits du miel délicieux de notre personnalité que nous y avons inconsciemment déposée pendant des années, alors que, fascinés par des buts égoïstes, nous ne la sentions pas; et maintenant, tout d'un coup, elle nous fait battre le cœur.¹

Here, already, is as clear a statement as one could wish of the Proustian formula of the enduring and continuous past. Here, too, in a primitive form, is the *procédé*, the notation, of the *madeleine* and the *petite phrase de Vinteuil*; and it is curiously significant that he should develop it with such spontaneous felicity and charm at this early date, especially when we remember the insipid artificiality of *Les Plaisirs et les Jours* written five years before. When, therefore, M. Pierre-Quint affirms:

La distance est grande entre ce livre [*Les Plaisirs et les Jours*] et le suivant; presque vingt ans seront nécessaires à Proust pour acquérir cette âpreté inouïe dans le trait d'observation, cette pénétration dans la pensée...²

he is evidently unconscious of the swift development that was taking place only a couple of years after its publication.

In these letters to his friend we can even watch the idea finding root and shape in Proust's mind as the years go by. A letter of March 1900, for example, touches on a slightly different aspect of the same theme, one that, as an artist, closely concerned him. Mlle Nordlinger had sent him some poems she had written, apparently lamenting her inexperience and ignorance in the art of writing:

Même ce qu'on appelle habileté technique n'est pas un savoir à proprement parler, car il n'existe pas en dehors des mystérieuses associations de notre mémoire et du tact acquis de notre invention quand elle approche les mots.³

Some three years later, in an undated letter, we find a similar thought of a store of past experience conserved for ever in the mirror that reflects a scene, the picture that represents it. That thought was his immediate response when she sent him a water-colour she had done, showing a clump of trees:

La plus jolie chose que j'aie jamais vue, c'est une fois, à la campagne, dans un miroir qui était adapté à une fenêtre, un morceau du ciel et du paysage, avec un bouquet choisi d'arbres fraternels. Et cet enchantement forcément fugitif d'une heure déjà lointaine, il me semble que c'est lui-même dont vous venez de me faire présent pour toujours. *Et le verre même du miroir couvre encore de sa protection mystérieuse et lucide le bouquet d'arbres... et l'heure passagère du ciel triste.* Combien je vous sais gré... de ce don d'un lieu de la nature, d'une heure de temps, d'une nuance et d'une minute de votre âme attentive à la nature.⁴

When we read such passages as these, it becomes difficult to accept Madame Riefstahl's suggestion that the packet of expanding Japanese flowers she sent him in 1904, which certainly inspired the image of the past gradually coming to life in *Swann*, actually contributed to the formation of the conception itself.⁵ It would appear more probable that they supplied a highly apposite symbol for a process already long familiar. Christmas candles and mandarines, the painting and the

¹ Ibid. pp. 2-3.

² L. Pierre-Quint, op. cit. pp. 38-9.

³ *Lettres à une amie*, p. 17. The italics in this and the next quotation are mine.

⁴ Ibid. pp. 28-9. The picture, she tells us, hung always by Proust's bed, and he gave it, shortly before he died, to Reynaldo Hahn.

⁵ Ibid. p. 119.

mirror, memory and the things with which its associations are mysteriously linked, enshrine in an ever-present 'present' an experience that is 'past'. That growing conception—plus a sensitive awareness of its possible, incalculable manifestations—had become habitual in Proust's mind, a deep-rooted attitude which coloured and conditioned his view of the universe, his whole interpretation of life.

Where, then, does Ruskin come into this maturing vision? In Proust's admiration for Ruskin in general two elements are worth isolating here. The first is the warmth of his response to Ruskin's theme of the survival of men, unknown or long-forgotten, in the houses or churches they built, in the work of the craftsman's hand and tools; and blended, often identified with this, is his ardent insistence that Ruskin's truest memorial is in the objects he loved and praised. The medieval craftsman's sense of beauty and Ruskin's thought alike will live and quicken the minds of men as long as the stones of Amiens or Venice endure.¹ The other, apparently less central, may have been even more powerful in the genesis of Proust's own art. To take perhaps the best illustration, it was Ruskin's remarks on reading that inspired him to the essay, *Journées de lecture*, published as a preface to his translation of *Sesame and Lilies*. That essay is the first draft, the first sure promise of the tender recording of early experience, that gives the exquisite picture of family life at Combray that is one of the loveliest and truest things in all his vast work. It holds the same place as the *Entretien avec M. de Sacy*, forerunning the infinitely richer *Pensées* of Pascal.² The direct influence on him of Ruskin's individual thought and particular theme had waned; but part of its function had been to arouse the Muse of Memory who inhabited Proust's mind and claimed him for her own.

Here the translations are seen to fall into an intelligible place. For Proust, it is clear, they had little importance, long before the end little interest, in themselves. But they served as a *tentative application of his 'formula' as an artist*, an exercise and a discipline in the way in which, by this time, he knew that his mind worked. Through all the intricate arabesque of his writing about Ruskin, his train of thought about translating him can be traced. His active admiration for Ruskin and his revelation was dead: 'Nous ne pouvons plus les chanter... il n'y a de poésie que des choses que l'on sent encore.' But—and it is the key to the whole matter—

Ne pouvant réveiller les flammes du passé, nous voulons du moins recueillir sa cendre... la mémoire des faits... qui nous affirme la réalité d'un paradis perdu au lieu de nous le rendre dans le souvenir.³

It is not yet, in 1900, the full conception of 'le temps retrouvé'; there was no precious and wholly personal *petite madeleine* to evoke the complete rapture of the primal experience. But there was the profound sense that the experience had been, there was the desire to save—in a fine phrase of Jules Romains—from 'le naufrage perpétuel qu'est chacun de nous', the maximum of the *fact*, before the memory of that, too, had perished.⁴

A perception of the analogy here suggested, between the resurrection of what Ruskin had once meant to him and the resurrection of his own past, certainly existed in Proust's mind; consciously or unconsciously his thought and phrase take

¹ For a characteristic expression of this, see *Pastiches et Mélanges*, 'Journées de pèlerinage', pp. 146-7, on Ruskin's 'Our Fathers have told us'; and the long excursus on the little figure in the doorway at Rouen ('Tu as vécu, tu vivras'), *ibid.* 'John Ruskin', pp. 175-8.

² Mr Roche, *loc. cit.*, has partially appreciated

this relation, without bringing out its full significance.

³ *Pastiches et Mélanges*, 'John Ruskin', p. 197.

⁴ 'Une mémoire qui ne se rappelle que les faits' is Proust's own description of his memory in the same context: *ibid.* p. 196.

the same turn in speaking of both. This is how he saw the task of translating Ruskin when the fires had died down:

C'est seulement quand certaines périodes de notre vie sont closes à jamais, quand, même dans les heures où la puissance et la liberté nous semblent données, il nous est défendu d'en rouvrir furtivement les portes, c'est quand nous sommes incapables de nous remettre même pour un instant dans l'état où nous fûmes pendant si longtemps, c'est alors seulement que nous nous refusons à ce que de telles choses soient entièrement abolies.¹

These words that lay bare a deep instinct of his nature find their richer echo in *Swann*, when he thinks of that task of greater piety to which he gave himself, the unending search after his own 'Temps perdu':

Mais quand d'un passé ancien rien ne subsiste, après la mort des êtres, après la destruction des choses, seules, plus frêles mais plus vivaces, plus immatérielles, plus persistantes, plus fidèles, l'odeur et la saveur restent encore longtemps, comme des âmes, à se rappeler, à attendre, à espérer, sur la ruine de tout le reste, à porter sans fléchir, sur leur gouttelette presque impalpable, l'édifice immense du souvenir.²

His devotion to Ruskin yielded one such 'gouttelette presque impalpable' to support the 'édifice immense' of *A la Recherche du Temps perdu*. At the beginning of the second volume of *Le Temps retrouvé*, the 'Marcel' of the narrative stumbles on the uneven pavement outside the Hôtel de Guermantes. Immediately he experiences the same sense of joy as when, on tasting the 'madeleine trempée dans une infusion', he found his whole childhood at Combray flooding back upon him. As on that greater occasion, the exact and full association comes gradually to life—his memories of Venice, submerged under the accumulated experiences of the years between. The link, the trivial, important stimulus, was the uneven paving-stones on which he had stumbled long ago in the Baptistry of Saint Mark's:

Et presque tout de suite je le reconnus; c'était Venise, dont mes efforts pour la décrire et les prétendus instantanés pris par ma mémoire ne m'avaient jamais rien dit et que la sensation que j'avais ressentie jadis sur deux dalles inégales du baptistère de Saint-Marc m'avait rendue avec toutes les autres sensations jointes ce jour-là à cette sensation-là, et qui étaient restées dans l'attente, à leur rang, d'où un brusque hasard les avait fait sortir, dans la série des jours oubliés. De même le goût de la petite madeleine m'avait rappelé Combray.³

An attempt to trace a strain in Proust's consciousness must needs describe a course circuitous like its subject, if on a smaller scale. But Marcel's stumbling on the Guermantes pavement brings us back to Venice, Ruskin and the letters to Mlle Nordlinger. It may therefore be well to define, briefly and categorically, the help towards a clearer understanding of Proust's 'genesis' that the *Lettres à une amie* afford. Their significance is threefold:

(1) They bring us into closer touch with Proust's interest in Ruskin and the technique of his translations, and enable us to gauge more accurately the nature and intensity of the phase while it lasted.

(2) They help to explain the relation of the Ruskin influence to *A la Recherche du Temps perdu* in two distinct respects:

(a) The function of Ruskin in the early stages as a general imaginative stimulus, in evoking, for instance, in the *Journées de lecture*, the first draft of the picture of life at Combray later embodied and developed in *Swann*.

(b) The application of the Proust technique of resuscitating the past to his Ruskin associations after his ardent admiration for Ruskin was over. In the translations

¹ Ibid. p. 196.

² *Swann*, I, 48.

³ *Le Temps retrouvé*, II, 8-9.

we are not dealing with a *positive* Ruskin influence; Proust is no longer concerned with Ruskin *qua* Ruskin, but with Ruskin *qua corpus vile*—as experimental material for his method.

(3) Parallel to, and contemporaneous with (1) and (2), the *Lettres* show the early, the unexpectedly early, emergence and the gradual growth of Proust's conception of the past, and of the agency of the affective stimulus in recalling it. The enzyme-like function in Proust's imagination of the *petite madeleine* and the *petite phrase de Vinteuil* is already implicit in the New Year letter of 1899 in which he dwells on the new and more living reality that Christmas has acquired for him, 'par la douce émanation des souvenirs accumulés'.

The range of theme and treatment in the *Lettres à une amie* is limited, even surprisingly limited from a writer so expansive. But Madame Riefstahl has put all students of Proust in her debt by publishing them, for they give direct, first-hand evidence of facts and processes in his experience that one suspected, but could not otherwise have known for certain, or seen in their exact bearing on the growth of his individual vision and peculiar art.

L. A. BISSON

OXFORD

THE ICELAND VOYAGE IN THE 'NIBELUNGENLIED'¹

As Prünhilt's island kingdom, where the Amazon-like queen² (*küeneiginne*, 326, 1; 330, 2, et seq.) was wooed by Gunther and won by Sívrit (cantos 6-8), Iceland perforce plays a somewhat conspicuous role in the geography of the early part of the *Nibelungenlied* (*NL*). In this sense it is well worth while to speculate on whether the account of the voyage to Iceland and the return answers in any way to reality, or whether it is sheer invention. Prünhilt's kingdom is named *Íslant* (heading to canto 6; 418, 1; 550, 3; 580, 1; 607, 4),³ but more frequently is referred to as *Prünhilde lant* (339, 3; 344, 2; 354, 3; 360, 4; 374, 3; 382, 3; 384, 2; 505, 4; 507, 4). *Íslant*, i.e. Iceland, is correctly conceived as an island (*über sê*, 326, 1); its marble-towered 'capital', *Ísenstein diu veste* (384, 3; 476, 3), 'the fortress Eisenstein', is unhistoric, a poetic invention.⁴ It may be noted that Prünhilt's association with Iceland seems to be peculiar to *NL*.⁵

But 'unauthentic' as is Prünhilt's residence in Iceland and un-Icelandic as is her capital, one may well ask, is this voyage (377, 2 ff.), and especially by the route suggested in *NL*, in and for itself plausible? Can the little that is told of the

¹ B-text, ed. by Karl Bartsch, considerably revised by Helmut de Boor, Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1940; references are to stanzas and stanza-lines.

² Cp. Antti Aarne-Stith Thompson, *The Types of the Folk-Tale* (Helsingfors, 1928), pp. 85-6, § 519.

³ MHG *Íslant* correctly renders ON and Icelandic *Ísland* 'land of drift-ice, of ice-floes', probably so named (c. 860) by the Norwegian Flóki Vilgerðarson (or Glámsón); see Hoops's *Reallexikon*, II, 602-3; E. M. Metzenthin, *Die Länder- u. Völkernamen im altisländischen Schrifttum* (Bryn Mawr, Penn. 1941), p. 48; Sigurður Nordal, *Íslands menning*, I (Reykjavík, 1942), 55. The phonology of mod. Germ. *Island*, *isländisch* is unhistoric, for one would expect *Eisland*, *eisländisch*; the short *i* of the first syllable of the mod. Germ. words may represent a spelling pronunciation of Renaissance Lat. *Islandia*, *islandicus*.

⁴ There is no Icelandic place- or nature-name answering to MHG *Ísenstein*; Icel. *járnsteinn* is a mineralogical term for a certain iron-bearing rock, corresponding to Engl. 'ironstone', Germ. 'Eisenstein', etc. It may be noted that the combination *isene steina*, 'iron-bearing rocks', occurs in Otfrid's *Liber Evangeliorum*, I, i, 70 (*Cur Scriptor*), where the mineral resources of the Franks are described and extolled. I do not know of a German place or castle called 'Eisenstein', though the combination exists as a family name; see A. Heintze-P. Cascorbi, *Die deutschen Familiennamen*, etc. (7th ed. Berlin, 1933), pp. 459-60, for place- and personal-names with *Stein* as a second element. The present combination is too obvious to be further laboured; it could occur to anyone at any time. It is once referred to as *Prünhilde burc* 'Prünhilt's fortified town' (477, 2), which as a mode of reference may be compared to *Etsel(e)n burc* of frequent occurrence. Though the poet describes the place less elaborately than *Etselen burc* and *Wormez*, he nevertheless furnishes a fair amount of detail about it. It is pictured as a fortress (*veste*, 383, 3), a fortified town (*burc*, 389, 2; 403, 4; 405, 1; 407, 1; 410, 3; 477, 2), located near the coast

(cp. *sant*, 396, 2; *fluot*, 403, 3). In it are eighty-six towers (*türne*, 404, 1) and three big palaces (*palaswite*, 404, 2); one palace would seem to be Prünhilt's special residence (469, 2; 511, 1), in which is her hall (*sal*, 400, 2; 404, 2-3) said to be of green marble; architecturally narrow windows are featured (389, 3; 395, 3; 398, 4), as are the crenellations (*zinnen*, 508, 1). Without the palace grounds are lodgings for the less distinguished visitors (*herberge*, 512, 1). Outside the town is a *rinc* (433, 1; 449, 2), a marked-out arena in which Prünhilt and Gunther, invisibly aided by Sívrit, contend at certain thoroughly homely, definitely not courtly, sports.

⁵ Her residence on some northern island (not Iceland, to all intents and purposes discovered c. 860) may be an old trait in her legend; so Andreas Heusler, *Nibelungensage u. Nibelungenlied* (3rd ed. Dortmund, 1929), p. 10. In the surviving documents the tradition concerning this point is far from constant. In the Eddic *Söl.*, introductory prose, Sigurðr finds her somewhere south in Frankish territory (*suðr til Frakklands*), repeated in *Vs.* ch. xx. The Edda gives no further information, but in *Vs.* ch. xxiv we are told that she is staying with her foster-father Heimir and that she is wooed by Gunnar and won by Sigurðr at *Hlymdalr* (var. *Hlymdalr*), not far from Heimir's home, itself not located. The Scandinavians perhaps gave little thought to the matter; in any event they probably knew better than to attempt any connexion with Iceland!

Piðreks saga, based as it is on Low German materials, pretends to a good deal of knowledge about Brynhildr's residence. In Bertelsen's ed. I, 38, ll. 11-17, we are told that her castle *Sægarð* is north of the Alps (*fjall*) in Swabia (*Sváva*); she also had another place near by in a forest (Black Forest?). In ed. cit. II, 38, l. 12, her castle is mentioned again as *Sægarðr* (varr. *Sægarð*, *Regard*). The word *sægarðr* would naturally mean 'sea-side place or building', with which compare ON *sæborg*. My friend Mr W. A. Paff points out to me that formally *Regard*, i.e. *Régarðr*, could mean 'the Rügen place', though I suspect that this agreement is accidental.

voyage in the poem rest on, or be fitted into, what is actually known of medieval travel routes from Worms, or the Rhine valley in general, to Iceland? The *NL* poet does, to be sure, no more than start the voyagers on their way. *Sívrít* more or less appoints himself captain (*scífmeister*, 377, 4),¹ claiming to know well the course and the currents (*wazzerstrázen*, 378, 3).² The company leaves Worms in a high wind (377, 2) with sheets taut (381, 1); *Sívrít* shoves their substantial vessel (*starkez sciffelín*, 367, 2—diminutive *metri causa*) from the river-side (379, 2) and heads down the Rhine (*ze tal den Rín*, 341, 1) towards the North Sea (*nider an den sê*, 367, 3).³ The first day, aided by a good breeze (381, 3), they are said to cover twenty miles (*zweinzec mîle*, 381, 2); Iceland with its *Ísenstein* is reached in twelve days (382, 1–3). Although these indications, with their nautical trimmings, are, as already observed, but a start, they indicate a start in quite the right direction and, more than that, the start of a very usual water-route from the Rhine valley to Iceland, one of the routes much frequented, for example, by Icelandic travellers, especially pilgrims, proceeding to and from Rome (*Rómferlar*, *suðrgöngumenn*). Of these routes, including the particular route of which *NL* here outlines a portion, the most detailed account is that from c. 1154 described by Nikulás Bergsson, himself a *Rómferill* and later abbot of the Benedictine foundation at Munkaþverá (Eyjafjarðar sýsla) in northern Iceland.⁴ Now Nikulás's own route as far as Worms⁵ was from Iceland to Norway (perhaps to Bergen), Denmark and down the Jutland peninsula, through Schleswig-Holstein, Hanover, Westphalia, Rhine-Hesse, to Mainz, thence on up the Rhine. But Nikulás describes with some care alternate routes taken by Icelanders, of which the following is here very much to the point:

Sú er önnur leið til Róms at fara ór Nóregi . . . til Deventar eða Trektar, ok taka menn þar staf ok skreppu og vígslu til Rómferðar. Ór Trektar er .vi. daga för til Kolnisborgar. . . Ór Kolni eru .iii. dagleiðir upp með Rín til Meginzuborgar, þar er erkibiskupsstóll at Kirkju <Martini et Stephani. Þá er dagför til Vormizuborgar. Þar er biskupsstóll at kirkju> Petri et Pauli. Þá er dagför til Spíru.⁶

¹ This passage is obviously open to comparison with the OE *Beowulf*, 205–224a and 1905–1912a; see Klaeber's note to l. 219.

² This is part and parcel of the shadowy tradition reflected elsewhere in *NL* of *Sívrít*'s earlier acquaintance with (? engagement to) *Prünhilt*; cp. 331, 4; 382, 4; 384, 1–2; 390–3; 411; 419; and see Heimir Hempel, *Nibelungenstudien*, I (Heidelberg, 1926), 133–4.

³ In 329, 1 this phrase is used by Gunther (*vogt vom Ríne*) in connexion with his desire to visit *Prünhilt*; in 367, 3 it is employed with reference to the destination of their ship.

⁴ The standard edition of Nikulás's travel diary is that of Kr. Kálund, *Alfræði íslenskr: islandsk encyclopædisk Litteratur*, I (Copenhagen, 1908), 12, ll. 26 ff. (abbreviated K, below); the earlier and still often cited edition is in E. C. Werlauff, *Symbolae ad Geographiam Medii Aevi ex Monumentis islandicis*, Copenhagen, 1821. The text is discussed and translated by Kálund in 'En islandsk Vejviser for Pilgrimme fra 12. århundrede', *Aarabøger for nordisk Oldkyndighed o. Historie*, 3rd Ser. III (1913), 51–105. See further my papers 'The Rome of two northern pilgrims, etc.', *The Harvard Theological Review*, xxxiii (1940), 277 ff.; 'The Haddeby and Schleswig of Nikulás of Munkaþverá', *Scandinavian Studies*, xvii (1943), 167 ff.; and 'Nikulás Bergsson of Munkaþverá and Germanic heroic

legend', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, XLII (1943), 210–18.

⁵ On Worms see note 6 ad fin., below.

⁶ K 14, ll. 7–16, with spelling and capitalization normalized. The transmitted text almost certainly suffers from a considerable lacuna; this I have ventured tentatively to supply in angular brackets. The difficulties in K's text are somewhat as follows: (1) The trip from Mainz to Speyer (c. 80 km.) is said to be a one day's journey; this is an abnormally long distance for one day, since Nikulás's average is c. 47 km. (2) It is, furthermore, extraordinary that so important a city as Worms should be altogether passed over, while so small a locality as Selz on the Rhine should later be included. (3) The *kirkja Petri et Pauli* of K 14, 16, almost surely refers to the cathedral of St Peter in Worms, here apparently fused with the then important church of St Paul, both probably built by Bishop Burkhard (1000–25); this would, incidentally, be the *tuom* (811, 2) or *münster* (812, 1), frequently mentioned and entering into the stage setting of the first part of the poem. (4) The cathedral of Mainz (archiepiscopal see) was, moreover, not dedicated to either Peter or Paul (though the city had two quite insignificant churches dedicated to these saints), but to God and St Martin and to SS. Martin and Stephen (the dedication chosen above). On these various churches see,

In translation the passage runs:

This is another route to take to Rome from Norway: to (Dutch) Frisia, (specifically) to Deventer or to Utrecht, and there one receives staff and scrip and a blessing for the pilgrimage to Rome. From Utrecht it is a six days' journey to Cologne... From Cologne it is a three days' journey up along the Rhine to Mainz where the archbishop's throne is in the church of <SS. Martin and Stephen. Then it is a day's journey to Worms, where the bishop's throne is in the church of > SS. Peter and Paul. Then it is a day's journey to Speyer....

A few comments on this route are in order. Neither here nor earlier in his narrative (*K* 13, 3-4) does Nikulás mention any stopping place in Norway, but Bergen is a likely destination.¹ From Bergen or elsewhere in Norway a sea voyage is to be assumed on a course running along the Danish and German coast to the Zuider Zee, with Deventer or Utrecht as terminals. Frisia, here essentially old West Frisia (*Frisia occidentalis* of Frankish terminology), embraces the territory between the Zuider Zee and the Rhine delta complex. Deventer on the IJssel (prov. Overijssel), an arm of the Rhine running into the Zuider Zee, was in the Middle Ages much frequented by Scandinavians,² as was no doubt Utrecht on the Crooked Rhine (Kromme Rijn) at the confluence of the Old Rhine (Oude Rijn) and the Vecht. Utrecht would have been reached by going up the Vecht from Muiden on the Zuider Zee. Parties arriving at Deventer and Utrecht and making for Cologne and points farther up the river would ordinarily meet at Arnhem, thence reaching the Rhine proper at some point near Nijmegen.³ A glance at a map will show that this route provided a surely welcome short-cut for travellers by sea and river from the north to, let us say, Cologne.

The time-table of the voyage out likewise deserves attention. The trip is said to have taken twelve days (381, 2). On the basis of such calculations as are possible this figure may be said to be rather low but not startlingly so.⁴ For purposes of rough computation the stretch from Worms to Iceland (from Deventer on, conceived as an approximately straight line) may conveniently be broken up into three sections: *A*, from Worms to, let us say, Deventer; *B*, from Deventer to some indeterminable point out in the North Sea between there and Iceland; and *C*, from Iceland to a point in the North Sea more or less equal to the distance between Iceland and Bergen in Norway. For *A* it may be said that, given favourable winds and the naturally swift current of the Rhine as are assumed in *NL* (377, 381), it should be possible to average c. 80 km. a day. Thus, in a vessel provided with sail and oars, the stretch of c. 450 km. between Worms and Deventer might well be covered in five or six days, perhaps less.⁵ So much for *A*. For *C* some information

for example, Georg Dehio, *Handbuch d. deutsch. Kunstdenkmäler*, vol. IV: *Südwestdeutschland* (Berlin, 1911), pp. 225-6, 241, 458-60, 465-6.

A word as to the reconstructed place-name *Vormizuborg*, 'Worms'. Despite the consistency of *e*-forms (*Verniza*, *Wermiza*, *Vermista*) of *Ps*. (see ed. cit. II, 414, col. 1), I am in the face of equally consistent Germ. *o*-forms (e.g. OHG *Wormize*, MHG *Wormize*, *Wormeze*, *Worm(e)z* = late Lat. *Wormatia*) reluctant to adopt *Verniza* or the like.

¹ See N. M. Petersen, *Handbog i den gammel-nordisk Geografi*, etc., Pt. I (Copenhagen, 1843), p. 95.

² Pointed out by Paul Riant, *Expéditions et pèlerinages des Scandinaves en Terre Sainte au temps des croisades*, I (Paris, 1865), 81; see also Arnold Norlind, *Die geographische Entwicklung des Rheindeltas bis um das Jahr 1500*, etc. (Lund, 1912), p. 161.

³ See Albert von Hofmann, *Das deutsche Land u. die deutsche Geschichte* (Stuttgart, 1920), p. 56 and map on p. 405; also Walter Vogel, 'Die Binnenfahrt durch Holland u. Stift Utrecht vom 12. bis 14. Jahrhundert', *Hansische Geschichtsblätter*, xv (1909), 13-36, with map at end.

⁴ Such appears likewise to be the case as to Beowulf's voyage from his Gautish homeland to Heorot, mentioned on p. 39, note 1 above.

⁵ If the unqualified MHG *mīle* (381, 2) is even approximately equal to the modern British statute mile, then the 20 miles or 32 km. said to have been sailed the first day can only mean that the voyagers made a late start or a very short day of it. But in medieval times the *mīle* often meant a considerably greater distance than its Roman ancestor *mīlia* (*passuum*) and perhaps was so thought of here; see Grimm, *Deutsches Wb.* under 'Meile'.

is available in Nikulás's diary where we are told in effect that a voyage from Iceland to Norway took seven days (*K* 12, 26–13, 1).¹ If one were to swing somewhat toward the west and point toward Deventer, the 1300 km. line drawn from, let us say, Vík in southern Iceland to Bergen, the southern end would lie out in the North Sea some 100 km. off the coast of Northumberland; in practice a straight line would not be possible, since from the Orkneys south the voyagers would have to make a detour to the east around the coast of Scotland. For *B*, roughly speaking, we are left with some 500 km. across the North Sea from the southern end of *C* to Deventer, the end of *A*, a stretch that might well be sailed in two or three days. These various time indications can, of course, only hope to be approximate, as are perforce to some extent the distances, but, taken all in all and with some rather ample allowances being made, there is, I think, fair reason to imagine that Gunther and Sívrít might be thought of as reaching Iceland in sixteen or seventeen days. In comparison with the twelve days allowed in *NL* (382, 1–3), the discrepancy—whether due to ignorance, inaccuracy, blind guess-work, or the poetic use of a conventional number—is slight, and the time is, in a word, realistic enough.

The account of the homeward journey from Iceland to Worms seems likewise not lacking in realism. The returning travellers, accompanied by Prünhilt (526, 1), are again favoured with a good wind (*ein rehtes wazzervint*, 527, 3) and journey for nine days (529, 1), a period of time that might well have let them reach a point off the Danish or German or Dutch coast. Gunther's remark (533, 1) that they are getting near home to his domains (*wir nâhen heim in mîniu lant*) needs mean nothing more than that they have sighted the Continent; 'we are approaching the Rhine' (*wir nâhen an den Rîn*, 533, 4) may be much the same thing as saying 'we are sailing down the North Sea toward the Rhine'. In any event the trip home up the Rhine by boat, then as now, was going to be a slow business compared with the down-stream journey out—hence the sensible proposal to set Sívrít ashore at some point to go ahead on horseback to Worms and bring advance tidings to Uote and Kriemhilt (cp. 535, 1; 541, 3; 542, 2; 543, 1). The statement in 541, 3, *dô reit er an den Rîn*, suggests, if nothing more, that Sívrít was thought of as going ashore some distance from the Rhine. If he landed up north, say at some point near Cuxhaven, he could have ridden up the Elbe to Stade on the Schwinge in Hanover,² thence south through Verden, Minden, Paderborn, etc., reaching the Rhine at Mainz, then on to Worms (*ze Wormez er dô reit*, 541, 3),³ where, however he came, he was cordially received (544, 1). If, on the other hand, he did not disembark at or near Cuxhaven, he may have stayed with the group until they actually reached Deventer and have started from there on horseback.

¹ Nikulás's estimate is substantiated from other sources. See Werlauff, op. cit. p. 34, §§ 18–19; Kálund in *Aarbøger*, art. cit. pp. 100–5; Fr. Ludwig, *Untersuchungen über d. Reise- u. Marschgeschwindigkeit im 12. u. 13. Jahrh.* (Berlin, 1897), p. 120.

² On the old network of highways in the valley of the lower Elbe see Gertrud Schrecker, 'Das spätmittelalterliche Strassennetz in Holstein u. Lauenburg', *Z. d. Gesellschaft f. Schleswig-Holsteinische Geschichte*, LXXI (1933), especially pp. 36 ff.

³ This would be essentially Nikulás's route outlined p. 39 above. It is one of the great north-south highways. For Nikulás the journey from Stade to Worms took some ten days, but most of the time the Iclander was probably walking. That the *NL* poet, and even Sívrít, knew some-

thing of this very route, i.e. from Worms into Saxon territory and perhaps to the Danish frontier on or near the Eider, is suggested in the account of the Saxon war waged against the brother-kings Liudegêr of Saxony and Liudegast of Denmark (canto 4): 'Von Rîne si durch Hessen mit ir helden riten| gegen Sahsen lande' (176, 1–2). Here the invading army would have followed the Rhine down from Worms to Mainz and, leaving the river at that point, would have proceeded through Hesse into Westphalia and so on to the Weser and Elbe, and beyond—a route and indeed a campaign that reminds one of Charlemagne's Saxon war beginning in 772: Charlemagne set out from Worms, went through Hesse to the Eresburg at Obermarsberg on the upper Diemel, near which he destroyed the famous *Irmînsûl*.

To look back. If one compares the indications in *NL* with those given by Nikulás of Munkaþverá it will be noticed that there are no discrepancies, no conflicts between the two accounts. The *NL* poet does not, it is true, burden the reader with minutiae, he does not name stopping places, of which there must have been several, on the way down the Rhine or subsequently. Either he did not know them or was not interested in them.¹ But I am more or less convinced that he knew something of the general route to Iceland.² In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries Iceland was likely enough quite as well known to Germans as it is to-day, then as now probably seeming somewhat remote, and so by no means an unsuitable locality in which to place Prünhilt and her fortress *Ísenstein*. As traders, explorers, and sailor warriors the Icelanders were in the Middle Ages familiar figures in many parts of Europe; to their far-flung expeditions, peaceful or predatory, the Icelandic family sagas and historical writings bear ample and often exciting witness. Moreover, this distant travelling does not stop with secular journeys, and after the Christianization of the island c. A.D. 1000 the call to Rome (over routes alluded to above) and to the Holy Land³ found frequent response in the hearts of the devout, the curious, and the venturesome. One recalls the words of Hrafn the Red (*Njáls saga*, ch. 157, § 20) when devils were on the point of dragging him down to the torments of Hell: 'Runnit hefir hundr þinn, Pétur postoli! tysvar til Róms ok myndi renna et þriðja sinn, ef þú leyðir' ('Thy dog [i.e. humble servant], Apostle Peter! has twice run to Rome and would run a third time if thou wouldst permit'). Scarcely a half-century before the composition of *NL* we have Nikulás's detailed diary. That Nikulás was but one of many Icelanders who passed through south-western Germany and Switzerland is evident from the thirty-eight Icelandic names (often Germanized in an interesting fashion) in the Reichenau necrology from A.D. 900 to 1100.⁴ Accordingly, it is not difficult to imagine the existence of channels through which the *NL* poet, obviously interested in geography,⁵ might have heard (1) of Iceland and (2) of that route via the Low Countries so clearly convenient for his heroes resident in Worms.

FRANCIS P. MAGOUN, Jr.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

¹ The account of Sívrit's momentous journey on horseback (68, 1) from his ancestral home in Xanten to the Burgundians in Worms (in quest of a bride) is equally bare of names; the time schedule of seven days (71, 1) there given is, however, plausible enough and may be profitably compared with corresponding parts of Nikulás's description of the route from Utrecht to Worms discussed above. His very special interest in the Danube country is a different matter.

² The account of the Iceland voyage exhibits, for example, none of the vagueness and confusion displayed in connexion with Sívrit's short side-trip from Iceland to the land of Albrich and the Nibelungs in connexion with which *Nibelunges burc* is said to be in *Norwæge* (739, 2-3); on the difficulties of this passage note Fritz Burg in *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*, XLV (1901), 128-30.

³ Cp. Riant, op. cit. supra, passim.

⁴ Printed in Alexander Jóhannesson, *Íslenzk tunga í fornöld* (Reykjavík, 1923-4), pp. 23-4,

and n. 1. Though many of the references would merely prove or point to a knowledge, a sort of text-book knowledge, of the names in question, nevertheless an examination of the names for Germany and various German districts in Metzenthin, op. cit. supra, would certainly furnish additional information concerning Icelanders in Germany, e.g. under *Alimandi*, *Austria*, *Austriki*, *Beheim*, *Beiaraland*, *Flandr*, *Flæmingaland*, *Frisland*, *Hollseta*, *Lorenge*, *Saxland*, *Sváfa*, *Theothonia*, *Pyryngaland*, *Þyðerska*.

⁵ For something of a display of geographical knowledge, at times almost Baedeker-like, there are the accounts of various trips between Worms and the land of the Huns; see, for example, Ernest Tonnelat, *La Chanson des Nibelungen* (Paris, 1926), pp. 348-41 and map facing p. 396 ('L'itinéraire de Kriemhild et des Nibelungen'); Karl Keller, 'Die Nibelungenstrasse', *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*, LXX (1933), 49-66 (map); Bartsch-de Boor, ed. cit., map attached to inside back cover.

SYMBOLISM IN HÖLDERLIN'S EARLY POETRY (1784-1800)

I

The derivative nature of Hölderlin's early poetry is easily observed, nor is it surprising that a poet who is so little actuated by motives of literary reaction should be content to adopt the thought and style of leading poets of his day. He was not, at first, conscious of his individuality as a poet, although, as his earliest letters testify, he never felt himself in harmony with his fellow-men. He strongly desired certain things, but he found that other poets were desiring them too, and he moulded his expression to conform with the manner in which they expressed themselves.¹ Klopstock and Schiller are the models whose style he persistently copied. A secondary source of his poetry is the work of Hölty, Heinse, Matthisson and Ossian. Although the mature style of each of these poets differs greatly from that of the others, the characteristic tones of each of them, whether hymnic, elegiac or idyllic, to a greater or lesser degree find their echoes in Hölderlin's early poetry.

One observation should be made at once. Hölderlin's early poetry is not less personal for being derivative in style. He carefully selects for imitation the style of those who feel as he feels. The work of other important contemporary poets finds no echo in his youthful poems. Goethe and Bürger, who also in their separate ways moulded poetic style in the era in which Hölderlin began to write, do not appear to have influenced him greatly, at least not in the early stage of his career. Furthermore, the fact that it is sometimes very difficult to say whether it is a poem by Klopstock, or one by Schiller that inspired Hölderlin, shows the profounder nature of his imitation. He often combines the styles of two of his models in one of his poems: a poem like 'Lied der Liebe' (vol. I, p. 86) begins in the manner of Hölty but continues in that of Schiller. The harmonious fusion of two such different styles can only be achieved by one who is imitating in no facile manner. The combination of styles practised here is a forecast of his later endeavour to fuse moods, tones and feelings into a progressive unity. But the moods and feelings are as yet indiscriminate, and he has still to recognize the principle on which is founded his later poetry, that the poet cannot accept a language prepared for him by another, that the invention of language is a major part of the poet's function.

If we examine Hölderlin's earliest poetry, written between the years 1789 and 1794, we find that there is at first little evidence of his use of symbols. Towards the end of this period, however, and increasingly during the next (1794-1800), there emerges a tendency to express himself symbolically. The use of symbols, together with his freer invention of rhythmical patterns, is the clearest sign of the maturing of Hölderlin's art.

The question arises as to the reasons for this absence of symbolism in the earliest work of Hölderlin, whose later poetry is so eminently characterized by the use of it. The spiritual values to which he pays tribute, the themes of his early poetry, are not as such inaccessible to symbolical treatment. The praise of solitude, purity,

¹ Cf. Hölderlin's own words in the earliest projected preface to *Hyperion*: 'Ich wünschte um alles nicht, dass es originell wäre. Originalität ist uns ja Neuheit; und mir ist nichts lieber, als was so alt ist, wie die Welt. Mir ist Originalität

Innigkeit, Tiefe des Herzens und des Geistes. Aber davon scheint man jetzt gerade, wenigstens in der Kunst, sehr wenig wissen zu wollen' (II, 545).

perfection, enthusiasm, friendship, fame, heroism, the attachment to nature, the rejection of the common world of man—these are his themes, and they do not in themselves constitute a barrier against the use of symbols. They are near enough in kind to the themes and values of Hölderlin's mature poetry to enforce the belief that the reason lies elsewhere. It is not the matter of Hölderlin's early poetry that fails to suggest to him the use of symbols, but the manner which he adopts—the declamatory style of Klopstock, the rhetorical manner of Schiller. Hölderlin's utterance, like theirs, is too direct, the flow of his thought and emotion is too unrestrained to enable him to achieve that figurative speech which is of the essence of symbolism. All great Symbolists have a distaste for excessively direct utterance. Mallarmé has expressed it most succinctly in the words reported by Huret:

Nommer un objet, c'est supprimer les trois quarts de la jouissance du poème qui est faite du bonheur de deviner peu à peu; le suggérer, voilà le rêve. C'est le parfait usage de ce mystère qui constitue le symbole: évoquer petit à petit un objet pour montrer un état d'âme, ou, inversement, choisir un objet et en dégager un état d'âme, par une série de déchiffrements.

Enquête sur l'évolution littéraire, p. 60

In his early poetry Hölderlin is concerned above all to say that he is experiencing such and such thoughts, feeling such and such emotions, and it is the fact that he is experiencing and feeling them that matters most to him. The thoughts and feelings signify more to him than the objects that elicit them, or the process by which they are elicited. The images of things are beyond his grasp and therefore their meaning is beyond his reach. His youthful style lacks allusiveness and subtlety. It is fervid and vigorous, but too nakedly expressive. Its purpose is expostulation, not revelation. It is only when the figurative value of things is the poet's chief interest, not his own feelings about them, that symbolist poetry becomes possible. It is obvious, however, that the feelings of the poet are a primary source of symbolist, as of other poetry; what he must discover is the just approach in which the world of symbols is opened to him, that balance of emotion and observation in contemplating things.

There is another reason why Hölderlin's early poetry does not show any marked tendencies towards symbolism. A second stage in his evolution as a poet is reached in that series of poems which, not altogether aptly, but by common consent, since W. Dilthey chose the name, have been called 'Hymnen an die Ideale der Menschheit'. Here it is not the poet's personality which is directly displayed, but those ideal powers which mould the destiny of man and rule the universe: Harmony, Freedom, Beauty, Love. The poet's view has become cosmic, and thus a step is taken by him towards the use of symbols. But again they do not enter the realm of his poetic interest to any marked degree, because he uses a traditional device which is as inimical to symbolism in its true meaning, as the immediate expression of feeling had been in the earlier stage. This device is the use of allegory, and here we may recall Goethe's apt definition of the difference between allegory and symbolism:

Die Allegorie verwandelt die Erscheinung in einen Begriff, den Begriff in ein Bild, doch so, dass der Begriff im Bilde immer noch begrenzt und vollständig zu halten und zu haben und an demselben auszusprechen sei.

Die Symbolik verwandelt die Erscheinung in Idee, die Idee in ein Bild, und so, dass die Idee im Bild immer unendlich wirksam und unerreichbar bleibt und, selbst in allen Sprachen ausgesprochen, doch unaussprechlich bleibe.

Sprüche über Kunst, nos. 1112-13¹

¹ Cf. Goethe's further distinction: 'Begriff ist Summe, Idee Resultat der Erfahrung; jene zu ziehen wird Verstand, dieses zu erfassen Vernunft

erfordert' (*Sprüche über Natur*, v, no. 1135). Goethe's *Werke*, Festaussgabe, xiv, pp. 391, 395.

The ideal powers which Hölderlin addresses become personified beings and their value is expressed in terms of human activity. Again he uses a method of utterance which is, though pictorial in quality, not figurative in essence.

Yet it is in these same poems that the beginnings of Hölderlin's mature symbolism are to be found. Some lines in poems belonging to this stage are potentially deeply significant:

Berge knüpft mit ehr'ner Kette
 Liebe an das Firmament,
 Donner ruft sie an die Stätte
 Wo der Sand die Pflanze brennt,
 Um die hehre Sonne leitet
 Sie die treuen Sterne her,
 Folgsam ihrem Winke gleitet
 Jeder Strom ins weite Meer.
 'Lied der Liebe' (I, 86; cf. 'Hymne an die Liebe' I, 138)

Wie ins weite Meer die Ströme gleiten
 Stürzen dir die Zeiten alle zu
 In dem Schoss der alten Ewigkeiten,
 In des Chaos Tiefen wohnest du.
 'An die Stille' (I, 88)

Ha! die frohen Geister ringen
 Zur Unendlichkeit hinan,
 Tiefer ahnungsvoller dringen
 Wir in diesen Ozean!
 Hin zu deiner Wonne schweben
 Wir aus Sturm und Dämmerung,
 Du, der Myriaden Leben
 Heilig Ziel! Vereinigung!
 'Hymne an die Freundschaft' (I, 137)

The accents of these passages, particularly the last, are still those of Schiller's 'An die Freude'. But the recurrence of the image of rivers flowing into the ocean indicates that thoughts and values peculiarly Hölderlin's own are beginning to manifest themselves. In earlier poems he had mentioned rivers, and he had described them in some detail (e.g. 'Die Meinige', I, 13; 'An meinen Bilfinger', I, 17). But they had possessed no meaning for him except as being objects of beauty which inspired sacred feelings in him. Similarly, he had mentioned the ocean in his earlier poems (e.g. 'Die Unsterblichkeit der Seele', I, 24), but again it is a physical phenomenon that he indicates, the turbulence and the expanse of the sea, a view that is maintained in such poems as 'Hymne an die Göttin der Harmonie' (I, 102 *passim*, notably p. 104), and the above-mentioned 'Hymne an die Freundschaft' (I, 135).

In the passages cited, on the other hand, it is not the phenomena themselves that arrest our attention, nor are the rivers and the ocean mentioned separately, but together. What has become important for Hölderlin is the course of the river towards the sea and the reception of the river by the sea. The phenomenon has become an image possessing a meaning. In the passages quoted the image is applied to two different but kindred subjects—love and friendship—and the merging of separate beings in love and friendship is indicated by means of this image. The ocean and the river have thus acquired symbolic value. It must, however, be noted that the poet's main interest resides in the subjects of love and friendship, not in the symbols themselves, and that these symbols are only an item in a series of mainly allegorical statements.

II

We reach a further stage in the poetry written during the years 1794-1800. The use of symbols increases and new elements of Hölderlin's thought begin to emerge. He continues to use the symbol of the river, new symbols appear (e.g. night, the eagle), and all of them acquire especial significance because they are connected with those new elements of thought.

Already within the previous period, particularly towards the end of it, from the year 1790 onwards, thoughts on time and fate had begun to occur with increasing frequency in Hölderlin's poems.¹ They assume greater significance now and, together with his reflexions on the gods, they represent the essence of his mature poetry. It is necessary therefore to explain his ideas on time and fate before his use of the symbols of the river, night and the eagle can be understood. A quotation will show how intimately the two themes belong together in Hölderlin's thought:

O Bruder! Bruder! Dass dein Bild so wahr
So schrecklich wahr des Lebens Wechsel deutet!
Dass Disteln hinter Blumengängen lauern—,
Und Jammer auf die Rosenwange schielt!
Und bleicher Tod in Jünglingsadern schleicht,
Und bange Trennung treuer Freunde Los,
Und edler Seelen Schicksal Druck und Kummer ist!

... ..
Ich sah' im Geist sich deine Stirne wölken,
In deiner Eingezogenheit—da ging
Ich trüben Blicks hinab zu meinem Neckar
Und sah in seine Wogen, bis mir schwindelte—
Und kehrte still und voll der dunklen Zukunft
Und voll des Schicksals, welches unsrer wartet,
Zurück—und setzte mich, und also ward
Die—freilich nicht erbauliche—Tirade
Vom ungewissen Wechsel unsers Lebens.

'Einladung an Neußer' (I, 144)

Hölderlin at this stage recognizes the workings of fate by observing the transience of life. Life passes and bears away with it all that is most valuable and beautiful. Time separates, oppresses and removes. There is no escape and time cannot be arrested. This is our fate and it is the young who feel its cruelty most keenly.

Such elegiac reflexions have nothing original in them: they are the lament of generations of poets. But in Hölderlin they are the starting-point of a series of developments which are to produce unique poetry. Underneath his lament lies his passionate desire for permanence and stability and for the preservation of the integrity and wholeness of life. Throughout the period of his life and poetry which we have thus far discussed, the notion of time occurs, invariably in its melancholy aspect. Hölderlin links time and the grave (I, 88, 91), or time and destruction (I, 137):

Siehe, Frücht' und Äste fallen
Felsen stürzt der Zeitenfluss

and it is only in such an early poem as 'Die Bücher der Zeiten' (I, 44) that the existence of evil is explained by him in the traditional terms of a theodicy.

This last-mentioned poem already contains an extension of the notion of time to include the passage of time in history, but it is only in the period under discussion

¹ Cf. Marshall Montgomery's remarks on the source of Hölderlin's ideas on Fate in *Friedrich Hölderlin and the German Neo-Hellenic Movement*, pt. I, 1923, p. 212 *passim*.

(1794–1800) that Hölderlin's view of history becomes really important for his poetry. It is a view that is not in the strict sense historical, but since it denotes an analysis of the ages of man's development, the term history is the only adequate description.

Here again Hölderlin is influenced by Schiller, who in his philosophy of history distinguishes two main eras of human evolution and envisages a third. The first is the age when man lived in harmony with nature, the second is the age in which reason rules man and man has forsaken nature, the third is to be the age in which the rule of nature is re-established by man himself with the aid of reason.

There is some justification for believing that Hölderlin may have evolved his scheme of human development independently. Indeed, ever since Rousseau's views had become known in Germany, such interpretations of the development of the human race were widespread. But as Hölderlin's scheme is dated after the time when Schiller had published his views and after Hölderlin had been in contact with him in Jena, it is safe to assume that Hölderlin at least elaborated his ideas under the influence of Schiller. Yet he modifies Schiller in several important respects in the works written between the years 1792 and 1796—years during which he was composing *Hyperion* and some of his better known poems. Hölderlin applies the scheme to the life of the individual as well as to that of the human race, and his formulations are such that they are more applicable to the former than to the latter. The clearest definition is found in the earliest sketch of a preface for *Hyperion*:

Die selige Einigkeit, das Sein, im einzigen Sinne des Worts, ist für uns verloren und wir mussten es verlieren, wenn wir es erstreben, erringen sollten. Wir reißen uns los vom friedlichen $\epsilon\nu$ καὶ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$ der Welt, um es herzustellen, durch uns Selbst. Wir sind zerfallen mit der Natur, und was einst, wie man glauben kann, Eins war, widerstreitet sich jetzt, und Herrschaft und Knechtschaft wechselt auf beiden Seiten...Jenen ewigen Widerstreit zwischen unserem Selbst und der Welt zu endigen, den Frieden alles Friedens, der höher ist, denn alle Vernunft, den wiederzubringen, uns mit der Natur zu vereinigen, zu Einem unendlichen Ganzen, das ist das Ziel all' unseres Strebens, wir mögen uns darüber verstehen oder nicht. (II, 545)

Hölderlin also differs from Schiller in that he tends to lose sight of the third stage of human development, the era when the ideal of harmony is re-established. He concentrates his attention on the ideal that has been lost, so that elegiac lament, not however without an affirmation of hope, becomes his main expression. The personal note in Hölderlin's lament is unmistakable. He feels, and his letters frequently voice the feeling, that he had himself once possessed and has now lost the ideal of harmony and beauty, and it is only his love for Diotima which for a short while brings back into his life possession of it. When he loses her (and he seems to have had a presentiment of the inevitability of this loss) the ideal recedes once more, never to return as a certain possession.*

These are the developments in the light of which such poems as 'Diotima' (II, 12), 'An Diotima' (II, 41) and 'Menons Klagen um Diotima' (IV, 82) must be read. Hölderlin's attitude to contemporary life derives from this source. He identifies the present age with the second stage of human development, when the ideal has departed, and the gods have withdrawn. It is an attitude that produces Hölderlin's great and mature poetry, in which his symbolism reaches its finest expression.

In the poetry which Hölderlin wrote during the years 1794–1800 this advance begins to manifest itself. It is revealed in the poems mentioned above, as well as in 'An die Natur' (II, 7). In this poem the first stage in human development is

given in stanzas 1-6, the second stage in the remaining three stanzas. In 'Diotima' the first three stanzas describe the third stage, the fourth stanza indicates the first stage, while the remainder of the poem elaborates the meaning of the second stage. In both poems the statement is purely personal, without reference to the age in which Hölderlin's life is spent. In 'An Diotima', however, a later work, this application is significantly made, in an appeal to Diotima to restore order in the chaos of the age. Diotima is a symbol of beauty, and beauty for Hölderlin is an expression of the harmony that rules in the first stage (hence children are beautiful) and is re-established in the third.¹ Hölderlin derives some consolation from Diotima's presence among those living in chaos,² but the poem ends on a note of despair:

Aber die Sonne des Geists, die schönere Welt, ist hinunter
Und in frostiger Nacht zanken Orkane sich nur. (II, 38)

Night has here become a symbol for Hölderlin. Night represents the period of chaos, the second stage of human development. He had already used it to indicate the second stage in his own development in 'Diotima', but in neither instance is the symbol elaborated. There is only the briefest indication of a symbolical reference, yet the symbol is a striking and effective one, particularly in the later poem. It is charged with associations enhanced by Hölderlin's revaluation of the 'Age of Enlightenment' as an 'Age of Darkness'. Its fullest meaning, however, will become clear only when Hölderlin's veneration of the life-giving powers of sun and light are made known, an element of his thought intimately connected with his views on the gods.

Before we approach this aspect of Hölderlin's work, his use of the symbol of the river remains to be discussed. In some of the poems written between 1794 and 1800 the image which he had used earlier recurs with an added meaning:

Oft verlor ich da mit trunknen Tränen
Liebend, wie nach langer Irre sich
In den Ozean die Ströme sehnen,
Schöne Welt! in deiner Fülle mich;
Ach! da stürzt ich mit den Wesen allen
Freudig aus der Einsamkeit der Zeit,
Wie ein Pilger in des Vaters Hallen,
In die Arme der Unendlichkeit.

'An die Natur' (II, 8)

O schonet mein! Allmächtig fortgezogen,
Muss immerhin des Lebens frische Flut
Mit Ungeduld im engen Bette wogen,
Bis sie im heimatlichen Meere ruht.

'Der Jüngling an die klugen Ratgeber' (II, 10)

Hölderlin's discomfort in the modern age is expressed in the first of the above passages. The new detail of the *erring* course of the river before it merges with the ocean reflects this aspect, while the beauty of nature takes the place of love and friendship in the earlier period. It is significant that contact with nature is an escape for Hölderlin from the loneliness imposed upon him by the times; it is now, as it will be later, not society that is for him a refuge, nor as yet his country. Like

¹ Cf. *Hyperion*: 'Der Moment der Schönheit war nun kund geworden unter den Menschen, war da im Leben und Geiste, das Unendlicheinige war' (II, 189).

² Cf. 'Diotima':
Wie melodisch bei des alten
Chaos Zwist Urania
Steht sie, göttlich rein erhalten,
Im Ruin der Zeiten da. (II, 14)

Rilke at a similar stage in his career, he 'skips the chapter of humanity' in its concrete organizations.

The same impression is gained from the second of the above passages. Temporal conditions are the narrow bed through which the current of life must pass towards infinity and eternity. It is in the poems belonging to this period, too, that Hölderlin's style, the rhythm and cadence of his verse, and his language are beginning to develop along lines peculiarly his own. A new note is heard, the abiding tone of urgency which is the characteristic quality of his great poetry.

In poems belonging to the period 1794-1800 we are also initiated into Hölderlin's view of the gods. It is an unusual view, and it is therefore of some importance to see the beginnings of its formation. In the 1795 version of *Hyperion* there occurs the following passage:

Genügsam ist die Natur, und ihres Lebens Einfalt verliert sich nie, denn sie erhebt sich nie in ihren Forderungen über ihre Armut. Genügsam ist der mangellose Geist, in seiner ewigen Fülle, und in dem Vollkommenen ist kein Wechsel. Der Mensch ist nie genügsam. Denn er begehrt den Reichtum einer Gottheit, und seine Kost ist (die) Armut der Natur.—Verdamme nicht, wenn in dem Sinnenlande das unbefriedigte Gemüt von einem zum andern eilt', es hofft Unendliches zu finden: durch die Dornen irrt der Bach; er sucht den Vater Ozean. Wenn sein vergessen, des Menschen Geist über seine Grenze sich verliert, ins Labyrinth des Unerkennbaren, und vermessen seiner Endlichkeit sich überhebt, verdamme nicht! Er dürstet nach Vollendung. Es rollten nicht über ihr Gestade die regellosen Ströme, würden sie nicht von den Fluten des Himmels geschwellt. (II, 510)

This passage defines the position of man in the universe. Nature is self-sufficient, and so are the gods. Man alone is dissatisfied. He alone aspires to a higher perfection, while the creatures of nature seek no further. The gods do not aspire, because they are perfect in the spirit (*mangelloser Geist*). The course of man through life is again symbolized by the river which floods its banks because it seeks the ocean. But a new detail is added to the image. The waters of the river (i.e. the spirit of man) are fed from above, and the river strives towards union with the ocean because it is divinely nourished.

Hölderlin now recognizes the supernatural powers which mould the character of man, and henceforth man is for him the creature of both heaven and earth. Invariably from this time onwards earth, the mother, and heaven, the father, are mentioned together by him when he considers the position of man. The powers of heaven, chief of which at this stage is Aether, draw man up, lift him above himself, refine and perfect his nature. Since these powers are spiritual in their essence, Hölderlin can say:

Der Äther, der uns umfängt, ist er nicht das Ebenbild unsers Geistes, der reine, unsterbliche? (II, 523)

It is the upward motion of the human spirit that Hölderlin, following an ancient tradition, attributes to the benign influence of divine Aether. Certain Stoic and Scholastic philosophers base some of their most important doctrines on the notion of the 'educative' power of light and aether. Milton's apostrophe to Light will readily come to the mind of those who are familiar with this idea. It is of considerable importance, too, in the historical and philosophical works of Goethe, Herder and Wilhelm von Humboldt, and leading biologists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries utilize it extensively. Hence the emphasis with which the image or symbol of plants and trees is used by all writers in these centuries

who concern themselves with human education and the formation of human character.¹

In Hölderlin the idea has become an even wider and more significant one, since it is not merely the life of man, but his very being, and his position in the universe that are indicated by it. Also, Hölderlin knows the danger as well as the dignity of man in thus aspiring to the realm of spirit. This is indicated in the passage quoted from *Hyperion*, and also in the poem 'An den Aether' (II, 23 passim). Every living being—plant, tree, fish, horse and bird—aspires to the realm of Aether, and each one of them remains bodily in the sphere to which it belongs.² The birds above all are happy because the air itself is their realm.³ Man alone in aspiring must enter a sphere to which he does not physically belong:

Töricht treiben wir uns umher; wie die irrende Rebe,
Wenn ihr der Stab gebricht, woran zum Himmel sie aufwächst,
Breiten wir über dem Boden uns aus, und suchen und wandern
Durch die Zonen der Erd', o Vater Äther vergebens
Denn es treibt uns die Lust, in deinen Gärten zu wandeln.

The homelessness of man, the incongruity of his physical existence and his spiritual desires, the disparity of his relationships—these are the perils of human life. To know them and to remain 'open' to the benign influences from above is all that is left to us. This is shown at the end of the poem 'An den Aether'. For Hölderlin, as for Rilke, 'openness' is an attitude which signifies the only possible escape from our compromising human situation:

Lass endlich, Vater! offenen Augs mich dir
Begegnen! hast denn du nicht zuerst den Geist
Mit deinem Strahl aus mir geweckt? mich
Herrlich ans Leben gebracht, o Vater!
(III, 10)

But Hölderlin also knows that the confining elements of human life have their value. The richness of human feeling and human aspiration is inconceivable, he believes, except as the product of the perilous situation in which man finds himself. This conviction is again most clearly expressed in a passage from *Hyperion*:

Was ist's denn, dass der Mensch so viel will? fragt' ich oft; was soll denn die Unendlichkeit in seiner Brust? Unendlichkeit? wo ist sie denn? wer hat sie denn vernommen? Mehr will er, als er kann! das möchte wahr sein! O! das hast du genug erfahren. Das ist auch nötig, wie es ist. Das gibt das süsse, schwärmerische Gefühl der Kraft, dass sie nicht ausströmt, wie sie will, das eben macht die schönen Träume von Unsterblichkeit und all' die holden und die kolossalischen Phantome, die den Menschen tausendfach entzücken, das schafft dem Menschen sein Elysium und seine Götter, dass seines Lebens Linie nicht gerade ausgeht, dass er nicht hinafährt, wie ein Pfeil, und eine fremde Macht dem Fliehenden in den Weg sich wirft. Des Herzens Woge schäumte nicht so schön empor, und würde Geist, wenn nicht der alte stumme Fels, das Schicksal, ihr entgegenstände.
(II, 134)

A further detail has now been added to the symbol of the river: the rock against which the waves have to hurl themselves signifies fate. An alteration in Hölderlin's attitude to fate is noticeable. It still includes the idea of transience, for the passage from *Hyperion* continues:

Aber dennoch stirbt der Trieb in unserer Brust, und mit ihm unsre Götter und ihr Himmel. Das Feuer geht empor in freudigen Gestalten, aus der dunkeln Wiege, wo es schlief, und seine Flamme steigt und fällt, und bricht sich und umschlingt sich freudig

¹ Cf. my dissertation *Die religiöse und die humanitätsphilosophische Bildungsidee*, Bern, 1934, especially p. 72 passim, and M. Montgomery, op. cit. p. 216.

² Cf. 'Die Eichbäume' (II, 22).

³ Cf. 'Der Mensch' (III, 8). A similar feeling is expressed by Rilke in *Duineser Elegien*.

wieder, bis ihr Stoff verzehrt ist, nun raucht und ringt sie und erlischt; was übrig ist, ist Asche. So geht's mit uns. Das ist der Inbegriff von allem, was in schreckendreizenden Mysterien die Weisen uns erzählen. (II, 135)

This feeling of transience does not disappear from Hölderlin's work, but it is modified by his newer recognition of fate as the obstacle in the path of human aspiration, and accepted as such without lament, because the impact enriches our lives. This function of fate in the human world enables Hölderlin to define the nature of the gods more clearly. Again it is a passage from *Hyperion* (an earlier version of the work) that indicates most clearly what he means:

Als unser Geist...

.....sich aus dem freien Fluge
Der Himmlischen verlor, und erdwärts sich,
Vom Äther neigt', und mit dem Überflusse
Sich so die Armut gattete, da ward
Die Liebe.....
Nun fühlen wir die Schranken unsers Wesens,
Und die gehemmte Kraft sträubt ungeduldig
Sich gegen ihre Fesseln, und es sehnt der Geist
Zum ungetrübten Äther sich zurück.
Doch ist auch wieder etwas, das
Die Fesseln gern behält, denn würd in uns
Das Göttliche von keinem Widerstande
Beschränkt—wir fühlten uns und andre nicht.
Sich aber nicht zu fühlen ist der Tod,
Von nichts zu wissen, und vernichtet sein,
Ist Eins für uns.....
Den Widerstreit der Triebe, deren keiner
Entbehrlich ist, vereinigt die Liebe.

(II, 499)

In this passage we have Hölderlin's theory of love, a theory strongly influenced by Fichte, whose lectures Hölderlin attended in Jena.¹ Love is possible only when there is feeling, and feeling, as we have seen from an earlier statement, and see again here, is the product of the duality of human nature. The impact of the two forces in man makes it possible for him to experience love. It is a sign of human poverty as well as of human plenitude, of human limitation as well as of human freedom, and it is this force which reconciles the conflicts within him.

Now since the gods are pure spirit and therefore not subject to the physical laws of existence, it must follow that they are not capable, nor have the need, of feeling the emotion of love. Hölderlin asserts that this is so. His gods do not love. Later, however, we shall hear him say that the gods need our love, although they cannot return it. We have here a metaphysical justification of human life (the metaphysical explanation of a poet, not a philosopher) that compares with Rilke's justification of human life in the Ninth Elegy.

Hölderlin's gods are further not subject to the laws of time and change in the sense in which human beings are subject to them, and hence they are not ruled by fate. *Hyperion's* 'Schicksallied' expresses this view:

Schicksallos, wie der schlafende
Säugling, atmen die Himmlischen;
Keusch bewahrt
In bescheidener Knospe
Blühet ewig

¹ Cf. especially Hölderlin's letter to his brother dated 13 April 1795 (II, especially p. 326) in which he explains Fichte's theory of consciousness. Cf.

also Montgomery's reference to passages from Herder's essay, 'Liebe und Selbstheit', *Studies in the Age of Goethe*, 1931, p. 93 passim.

Ihnen der Geist
Und die seligen Augen
Blicken in stiller
Ewiger Klarheit.

(II, 269)

This only means that the gods do not grow, mature and die. It does not mean, as we shall see later, that they do not have their appointed hour of rule and are not compelled, by a will not necessarily their own, to relinquish this rule when the time comes for them to do so. It is one of Hölderlin's profoundest convictions that the gods rule the lives of men in some ages and vanish from the human world in others. There are ages in the history of man when the presence of the gods is not made manifest, and Hölderlin counts his own day among these.

One of the misfortunes from which he suffered most keenly was his awareness of the absence of the gods and, foreseeing their return, his greatest hope was to live for it. He despaired at first when he knew that this was not to be in his own life-time, but he finally accepted destiny and contented himself with proclaiming the absent gods. For him it is essentially the mission of the poet to proclaim them, as the poems 'An die jungen Dichter', 'An unsre grossen Dichter', 'Die schein-heiligen Dichter' (III, 3-5) show.

The respective realms of the gods and men are thus clearly defined by Hölderlin at a time when he is becoming increasingly aware of his own position. Inherent in this situation lies a danger which he reveals in his dramatic work *Empedokles*, particularly in the earlier versions.

In the essay entitled 'Grund zum Empedokles' (III, 316 *passim*), written when Hölderlin's first intentions had been modified and when, apparently, he had given up hope of completing the drama, he states that Empedocles was to be presented as a victim of his times which required neither a poet, nor a hero, but a sacrifice.¹ In the earlier conception, on the other hand, Empedocles's death was to have been the result of an act of guilt on his own part, rather than an act of sacrifice. His own words are the clearest indication of this original plan:

Es ist vorbei,
Und du, verbirg dirs nicht! Du hast
Es selbst verschuldet, armer Tantalus!
Das Heiligtum hast du geschändet, hast
Mit frechem Stolz den schönen Bund entzweit
Elender! Als die Genien der Welt
Voll Liebe sich in dir vergassen, dachtest du
An dich und wähnstest, karger Tor, an dich
Die Gütigen verkauft, dass sie dir
Die Himmlischen, wie blöde Knechte, dienten!

(III, 89)

The priest Hermócrates puts it more bluntly:

Da sitzt
Er seelenlos im Dunkel. Denn es haben
Die Götter seine Kraft von ihm genommen
Seit jenem Tage, da der trunkne Mann
Vor allem Volk sich einen Gott genannt.

(III, 82)²

For Hölderlin, as for Goethe, Hubris is a sin visited by the severest punishment. The gods themselves punish any man who strives to be their equal. Empedocles's

¹ Cf. especially vol. III, pp. 326-8.

² Cf. Empedocles:

Die Götter waren
Mir dienstbar nun geworden, ich allein
War Gott und sprach ins freche Stolz heraus.

(III, 95)

sin appears to have been even greater than this. When the gods favoured him, he tried to make them serve him. The possibility of such an action is not denied by Hölderlin; indeed, throughout his life, as evinced particularly in his letters to his mother, he lamented abuses in religious practice. Empedocles himself says to the priest:

Hinweg! Ich kann vor mir den Mann nicht sehn,
Der Heiliges wie ein Gewerbe treibt,
Dein Angesicht ist falsch und kalt und tot,
Wie deine Götter sind.

(III, 98)¹

The retribution which arrogance, such as that of Empedocles, entails, is spiritual inertia, a deadening of the spiritual powers in man, a state corresponding exactly to the second stage in human development, when mankind is deserted by the gods. Empedocles's apathy is of the same quality as life in the era of night in which Hölderlin lives. Indeed, it often appears that Hölderlin accuses his own age of a guilt similar to that committed by Empedocles, resulting in like consequences. Empedocles can thus be considered a symbolical figure illustrating the decadence of life in Hölderlin's day. Even when Hölderlin alters his conception of the dramatic action, as indicated in *Grund zum Empedokles*, and attaches less importance to the guilt of his hero, the symbol remains. In one sense it is reinforced by the change, since he now stresses the historic importance of the action and emphasizes the symbolic nature of his hero's fate.

This change is indicative of the final stage in Hölderlin's ideas concerning these matters. As we shall see, his last great poems are inspired by an attempt to understand and accept his own age, rather than lament its shortcomings. This 'Wendung' (to use his own term) results in a new assessment of the departure and return of the gods. In *Empedokles* it was by the favour of the gods that the lives of men were hallowed and through the guilt of man that they became sterile. Now the gods do not abandon the world because they are provoked to do so; they depart from it in obedience to a profound law of being. It is this law which Hölderlin endeavours to understand in his final work.

It has already been said that another characteristic of Hölderlin's poetry in his last period is the personal nature of his utterance which approximates his use of symbols to that of the French Symbolists.² In addition to his views of life, nature, man and the gods, his feelings about himself as a man and a poet become an important source of his symbolism. The more we approach the final stage, the more arresting becomes his personal utterance. The greater part of his confessional poetry is the product of acute self-knowledge. We do not possess the key to every aspect of it, since the reports and documents of his later life, particularly of the crucial events in Bordeaux, are not reliable; but the voice of Hölderlin in his poetry is the voice of a man who knows what is happening to him and whose suffering is increased immeasurably by his knowledge.

A good deal of Empedocles's self-recrimination is obviously Hölderlin's accusation against himself, and much of the poetry written during the years 1794-1800 is an expression of personal inadequacy.³ Personal references abound in the poems of the first period (1784-94), but they are commonplace in character and usually draw our attention merely to the particular feelings which the poet experiences in a given situation. It is in the second period that Hölderlin reveals the hidden springs of his being and voices his profound misgivings about himself. He uses his

¹ Cf. 'Die scheinheiligen Dichter' (III, 5).

² Cf. *Mod. Lang. Rev.* xxxviii, 226-35.

³ Cf. M. Montgomery, loc. cit. p. 110 passim, and Hölderlin's letter, v, 321.

favourite symbol, the river, to indicate his own shortcomings. The poem 'Stimme des Volks' provides an illustration:

Du seiest Gottes Stimme, so ahndet' ich
In heiliger Jugend; ja, und ich sag' es noch.—
Um meine Weisheit unbekümmert
Rauschen die Wasser doch auch, und dennoch
Hör' ich sie gern, und öfters bewegen sie
Und stärken mir das Herz, die gewaltigen;
Und meine Bahn nicht, aber richtig
Wandeln ins Meer sie die Bahn hinunter. (III, 14)

Hölderlin's isolation among men is revealed in this poem, and his eccentricity is now felt by himself to be a fault. A further example is found in 'Der Main'. The poet feels himself to be homeless and has to seek a land beyond the seas, but he remains a wanderer forever. The river, on the other hand, is certain of its course through country to which it belongs and its destiny is assured:

Zu euch vielleicht, ihr Inseln! gerät noch einst
Ein heimatloser Sänger; denn wandern muss
Von Fremden er zu Fremden, und die
Erde, die freie, sie muss ja leider!
Statt Vaterlands ihm dienen, solange er lebt,
Und wenn er stirbt—doch nimmer vergess ich dich,
So fern ich wandre, schöner Main! und
Deine Gestade, die vielbeglückten.
Gastfreundlich nahmst du, Stolzer! bei dir mich auf,
Und heitertest das Auge dem Fremdlinge,
Und still hingleitende Gesänge
Lehrtest du mich und geräuschlos Leben.
O ruhig mit den Sternen, du Glücklicher!
Wallst du von deinem Morgen zum Abend fort,
Dem Bruder zu, dem Rhein; und dann mit
Ihm in den Ozean freudig nieder! (III, 55)

What we have heard Hölderlin say about man and his position in the universe is here said by him about himself and his own position in the human world. There is the same contrast between the certitude of the river and the disorientation of human life, and the poet's isolation is even sharper than that of other men. This is the feeling which predominates in Hölderlin's personal poetry towards the end of his second period, a sense of loneliness, most movingly expressed in one of his greatest poems, 'Abendphantasie'. With equal force he voiced his feeling in a letter to Susette Gontard, in which are summarized the impelling emotions of his poetry at this stage:

Täglich muss ich die verschwundene Gottheit wieder rufen. Wenn ich an grosse Männer denke, in grossen Zeiten, wie sie, ein heilig Feuer, um sich griffen, und alles Tote, Hölzerne, das Stroh der Welt in Flammen verwandelten, die mit ihnen aufflog zum Himmel, und dann an mich, wie ich oft, ein glimmend Lämpchen umhergehe, und betteln möchte um einen Tropfen Öl, um eine Weile noch die Nacht hindurch zu scheinen,—siehe! da geht ein wunderbarer Schauer mir durch alle Glieder, und leise ruf' ich mir das Schreckenswort zu; lebendig Toter! (June 1799, III, 444)

E. L. STAHL

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

THE WITH-MYRGINGS OF 'WIDSITH'

In *Widsith* 118 the tribe or subtribe called *Wiþmyrgingas* is spoken of in laudatory terms:

Ða wloncan gedryht Wiþmyrginga.

The tribal name seems to be a formation parallel to *Healfhundingas* 23 and *Lidwicingas* 80. Note also such composite names as *Holmrycgas* 21, *Sædene* 28, *Heaðobeardan* 49, *Hreðgotan* 57, and *Gefflegan* 60.¹ The *wiþ* of *Wiþmyrgingas* has never been explained with plausibility. For attempts at explanation the reader is referred to my edition of *Widsith*, pp. 197 f. The present paper is restricted to a suggestion not hitherto made: the With-Myrgings may have been that branch of the Myrging tribe which lived on the With river and thereabouts.

This river, the modern Vid (Danish) or Wied (German), is an important stream of western Sleswick. It flows by Tønder and empties into the North Sea near Højer. To the south of the river lies a coastal area called Viding Herred (Danish) or Wiedingharde (German). According to Svend Aakjær,² this area owes its name to the Vid river. *Viding* as a name for the *Herred* has not been traced further back than c. 1400; in the thirteenth century another name, Horseby Herred, was in use.³ And yet, by virtue of its *-ing* suffix, *Viding* has every claim to great antiquity. It seems reasonable to infer that in olden times the name applied, not to a single district near the Vid river, but to the river valley as a whole, or (in the plural) to the inhabitants of that valley. In other words, *Viding* probably goes back to an old tribal name,⁴ and its present restriction to a mere *herred* is secondary and late.

If the Vidings were a tribe which in the Germanic heroic age (i.e. the early centuries of the Christian era) lived on the Vid river and thereabouts, one might well expect to find them in *Widsith*. I suggest that they actually appear in this poem, under the name *Wiþmyrgingas*.⁵ If so, the name element *wiþ* answers to the river-name *Vid*, and the etymology of this river-name must be considered. The oldest spellings of the name show a variation between monosyllabic *With* and disyllabic *Withæ* or *Withy*.⁶ This variation makes impossible any connexion with the English adj. *wide*; it leads one, rather, to the Icelandic doublets *við* and *viðia*, 'withe, withy'. Note also the following words with a long vowel: Icelandic *viðir*, OHG *wida* 'willow' and OE *wīþie* 'withe, withy, willow'.⁷ In all likelihood our river-name belongs to this word group, and the river got its name through an association of some kind with willows.⁸ It seems plausible to presume (in spite of Icel. *viðia* and its cognates) that the disyllabic forms of the river-name had long *i*,

¹ The element *geft* is best connected with Gothic *gibla* 'pinnacle', Greek *κεφαλή*. Earlier suggestions are mentioned in my edition of *Widsith*, p. 147.

² *Kong Valdemars Jordebog*, 5. Hæfte (Copenhagen, 1936), p. 93.

³ Aakjær, loc. cit.

⁴ For a like view, see Gudmund Schütte, *Danske Stednavne fra Arilds Tid* (Copenhagen, 1927), p. 97.

⁵ In much the same way the Liðungs of the Oslo Firth (the Vik) appear in *Widsith* under the name *Lidwicingas*; see my edition of the poem,

pp. 26 f. and 173 f., and compare *Medium Ævum*, vi (1937), 213.

⁶ See Schütte, loc. cit.

⁷ For other words of this group, see the etymological dictionaries. The variation between long and short *i* in these words is probably due to ordinary gradation; see A. Noreen, *Altisländische Grammatik*, 4th ed. p. 143. But the long vowel may possibly go back to IE long *i* (rather than to IE *ei*).

⁸ The Essex river-name *Wid* is a back formation from the place-name *Widford* 'willow ford'. See E. Ekwall, *English River-Names* (Oxford, 1928), p. xlii.

while the monosyllabic form had short *i*. In any case, the *wiþ* of *Wiþmyrgingas* answers with precision to the monosyllabic variant of the river-name.

From *With-* we now turn to *-Myrgings*. Whether the Myrging name meant simply 'mire dwellers' or more precisely 'mire-district dwellers',¹ the etymology of the name points to a miry or marshy habitat for the tribe so named. The two *herreder* of Horseby and Bøking in western Sleswick, south of the Vid river, made such a habitat: they were grouped together in the Middle Ages as the *marsk-herreder* 'marsh districts'² and they belonged, together with the island of Syld (Danish) or Sylt (German), to a *præpositura in Wytha*.³ It is even possible that the official term *marsk-herreder* arose as a reminiscence of the old name *Myrgingas*, though no such explanation of the term is needful. We have further evidence that a branch or subtribe of the Myrgings once had holdings in Sleswick. In the Offa episode of *Widsith* we learn that King Offa waged war against the Myrgings with great success:

- 41 Ane sweorde
 merce gemaerde wið Myrgingum
 bi Fifeldore. Heoldon forð siþpan,
44 Engle and Swæfe, swa hit Offa geslog.

With single sword he made known [i.e. dictated] a boundary against the Myrgings at Fifeldor. Thenceforth the Angles and Sweves held [the kingdom] as Offa had gained it.

From this passage it would appear that Offa by his victory over the Myrgings confined that tribe to Holstein (i.e. to the region south of the Eider). If so, it follows that before Offa's campaign the Myrgings had holdings in Sleswick as well.

The original seats of the Angles lay in eastern Sleswick, as we know. The holdings of their allies the Sweves were in western Sleswick, north of the Eider: these holdings certainly included the valley of the Treene and probably extended to the North Sea. There remained for the Myrgings of Sleswick the two marsh districts mentioned above, along with the valley proper of the Vid. We cannot say whether or not the With-Myrgings held the whole of this valley, but their settlements were such that they could be called With-Myrgings by way of distinction from the main body of the tribe in western Holstein. Offa's great victory over the Myrgings presumably led to the incorporation of the With-Myrgings in the English kingdom. The extension of the English king's authority to the North Sea coast of Sleswick made possible the later migration of the Angles to Britain, a migration which obviously would never have taken place had the English holdings remained strictly Baltic. Offa's war with the Myrgings, then, must be reckoned one of the great turning-points of English history, and any light which name study can throw on this dark but important period is to be welcomed.

KEMP MALONE

BALTIMORE

THE CONCESSIVE USE OF 'QUANT' IN OLD FRENCH

In 1931 Professor F. J. Tanquerey⁴ examined *Aucassin et Nicolette*, II, 23:

Ja Dix ne me doinst riens que je li demant, quant ere cevaliers, ne monte a ceval, ne que voise a estor ne a bataille, la u je fiere cevalier ni autre mi, se vos ne me donés Nicholette me douce amie que je tant aim

¹ See my discussion, *MLN*, LV (1940), 141 f.

² Aakjær, loc. cit.

³ J. Langebek and P. F. Suhm, *Scriptores*

Rerum Danicarum. Medii Aevi, VI (Copenhagen, 1786), 580.

⁴ *Romania*, LVII, 562-8.

and expressed dissatisfaction as to its sense and construction, although it appeared a second time in VIII, 20. In particular he objected to the use of *ne* for *et* in *ne monte a ceval* and of the subjunctive *voise* after *que* replacing *quant*. His tentative solution was to read *se monte* for *ne monte*, although, as he admitted, it is unlikely that the scribe committed the same error twice.

Two years later, Professor Mario Roques¹ took up the question and pointed out M. Tanqueray's fundamental error in taking *quant* as purely temporal. He proposed to take the sentence as 'une imprécation éventuelle sous condition'. His chief difficulty is to explain the construction of *ne monte...ne que voise...*, for, as he remarks, there are examples of the subjunctive in the second verb dependent upon *quant* but 'dans ces exemples, la proposition au subjonctif est une conditionnelle complétant une véritable temporelle'. Similarly, in the case he quotes² of *ne* co-ordinating two 'éventuelles' introduced by *quant*, the second verb is in the future not the subjunctive, which is hence not a true parallel. The grammar of *ne monte a ceval* remains a difficulty.

For the sense of *quant*, M. Roques has given the case of Modern French 'Il fera chaud quand (le jour où, etc.) je ferai cela', and this is a useful starting-point. If we take a similar construction from popular speech, 'When you see me do such a thing, kick me', we find that *when* is equivalent to *if ever* and expresses an eventuality which the speaker regards as unlikely.

It may be that this use of *quant* is a remnant of the Latin *si quando*, 'if ever', taking the future or future perfect. In that case the *si* would have dropped from the language whilst remaining in the idea: this would explain why we have the future immediately after the *quant* but the subjunctive later, dictated by the latent idea of *if* in the conjunction which governs it at a distance, as it were.

On the other hand, it is perhaps unnecessary to go back to *si quando* for the sense of *if*. Old French offers many cases in which *quant*, 'when', contains a certain concessive element. To select a few at random from the recently published *Roman de Balain*:³

Par foi, fait li autres, je sai bien, se je m'en vois avoec vous...qu'il me couverra a laissier ceste queste ou je sui entrés. Et *quant je l'avrai laissie, qui sera cil qui le prendra?*⁴
The last sentence is almost, 'if I drop it, who will take it on?'

Voire, fait cil as deus espees, se vous volés metre en aventure de mort pour savoir che la ou vous ne porriés riens gaaigner—car *quant vous le saverés, se n'i gaaignerés vous riens*—par foi, onques mais je n'oi si faite derverie.⁵

Here the italicized words are roughly the equivalent of 'even if you know it, you will be no better off'.

Gallans, che n'est mie le premier duel que tu m'as fait!
Et cil respont:
Si t'en venge quant tu porras.⁶

The *quant* here contains the idea, 'if ever that time comes', an impression which is confirmed by the first speaker's reply: 'Si ferai je...assés plus tost que tu n'oseroies cuidoer.'

Allowing *quant* to have the sense of *if* in certain cases,⁷ then in the *Aucassin et Nicolette* passages it is not surprising to find *quant ere cevaliers* for 'if ever I become

¹ *Romania*, LIX, 423-6.

² *Escanor*, v, 2966.

³ *Le Roman de Balain*, ed. D. Legge (M.U.P.), 1942.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 44.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 77.

⁷ It is interesting to note that Spanish still recognizes the concessive element in 'when' by requiring the subjunctive after *cuando* when the main verb is future or imperative.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 52.

a knight'. In that it is referring to a future contingency and is introduced by *quant*, the verb following immediately upon it would inevitably be in the future tense.

What of the use of *ne (que)* to replace the *quant* and to serve for 'and'? Here we may accept Nyrop's conclusion that *ne* joins two positive expressions in clauses of condition or concession¹ and to it add Brunot's distinction between *ni* and *et*, that *ni* 'tout en joignant les termes, disjoint les idées',² for it is clear that Aucassin intends his father to note each one of the things he does not intend to do. Moreover, the fact that Aucassin does not intend to become a knight, nor mount his horse, nor join in the battle shows that his idea is mainly a *negative* one, which increases the necessity for *ne* rather than *et*. The use of the subjunctive seems to be governed by the *que* (expressed or unexpressed) which repeats the strongly implied concessive *if*.

It may perhaps be added in conclusion, that the final clause 'se vos ne me donés Nicholette...' appears to express two distinct mental ideas. It serves as the condition upon which the former condition is based, i.e. it implies, 'if you *do* give me Nicolette, then I *shall* become a knight and mount my horse and go to battle'. Equally it is partly causal, 'since you will not give me Nicolette, then may God ignore my prayers if I do what you want (if ever that day comes)'. In short, the whole sentence is the expression of a double mental attitude, on the basis of which we can account for the individual propositions used, whilst finding it difficult to formulate any simple grammatical rule to explain the sentence visualized as a whole.

KENNETH URWIN
NANCY JONES

CARDIFF AND ENGLEFIELD GREEN

GOETHE AUTOGRAPHS IN THE ALBUM OF AN IRISHMAN

Among recent acquisitions of the Bodleian Library is an album with autograph pages by Goethe, his friends, his family and many members of the Weimar society of 1826. It belonged to St George Cromie, an Irishman, one of the many young men from these islands who visited Weimar during the last decade of Goethe's life, and often stayed for months or even years. The story of this procession of foreign visitors, which began before Goethe's relation to Carlyle was established, has not yet been written. So our knowledge depends on scattered remarks in published diaries and letters of the time, on some casual information given by Professor H. H. Houben in his book on Eckermann, and on an article on 'Englishmen in Weimar' by A. G. Alford in vols. v and vi of the Publications of the English Goethe Society. Some of the visitors are well-known people, Crabb Robinson, for instance, or Des Voeux, the translator of *Tasso*, but about most of them very little is known, and St George Cromie is among these. The majority seem to have been young men under twenty. They stayed at the *Pension* of a Professor Melos and his wife, and from 1824 onwards were taught by Eckermann who also introduced them to the Goethe-Haus.³ These so-called *Engländer* were English, Scotch or Irish, the latter being particularly popular. Some of the visitors were army officers, some had introductions to the court, one was recommended to Goethe himself by Byron,

¹ *Grammaire historique de la langue française*, vi, 152.

² *La Pensée et la langue*, p. 126.

³ See H. H. Houben, *Goethes Eckermann*, Berlin, 1934, p. 95 et passim and J. P. Eckermann, *Gespräche mit Goethe*, 10. Januar 1825.

some had literary, some diplomatic interests. They were the lions of the day in Weimar, very spoilt by the society of this little town with its high intellectual and social traditions and ambitions, and sometimes they were a nuisance. They were all frequent and welcome guests at Ottilie von Goethe's hospitable tea-table, and it is mainly through her diaries and letters that we get an impression of the many romantic love affairs or rather disasters which these young heroes caused among the excitable ladies of that circle.

St George Cromie, according to Ottilie's diary,¹ arrived at the beginning of November 1824, together with his brother, and he stayed till the end of July 1826. His departure is mentioned in a letter of Goethe to Ulrike von Pogwisch of 22 July 1826, where he says: 'Von Engländern ist zu sagen: daß der gute Cromie, nachdem ihn Schmeller glücklich abkonterfeiet, wiewohl ungern, nach wiederholtem Zaudern endlich abgereist sey und wenn er Urlaub erhalten kann, lieber in Weimar als in Indien verschmachten möchte.' This latter remark suggests that he too was in the army and this is confirmed by some letters about his brother's sudden death addressed to him in 1830 when he was a Lieutenant in Halifax, Nova Scotia. (These letters are contained in a brown leather wallet bearing the signature of August von Goethe and the date 19 July 1826, which was given to the Bodleian with the album.) The fact that he was one of the fourteen Englishmen who at Goethe's wish had their portraits taken by Schmeller so as to leave a 'memento'² shows that he must have been rather popular with the 'Alter Herr'. During the later months of his stay his name appears several times in Goethe's diary among the visitors or guests of Goethe himself.³ It was he who procured for the poet in the summer of 1825 Major Parry's *The Last Days of Lord Byron*, which made so deep an impression on Goethe.⁴ The younger generation of the Goethe-Haus also seems to have been fond of him. August took an almost fatherly interest in St George and does his best to extricate him from an emotional crisis which he went through in the summer of 1825. He writes to his wife who had gone to Jena for a few weeks: 'George geht umher wie verlassen... und spielt den im Irrgarten von Tiefurt vor Liebe herumtaumelnden Cavalier.'⁵ Ottilie in her lavish manner seems to have showered presents on him. In an affectionate letter without date which St George put into the album later on, she mentions a cup with the picture of the old theatre which was burnt down while he was at Weimar, probably a good-bye present. A. v. Keller in vol. 1 (p. 386) of the *Goethe-Jahrbuch* tells of some other gifts which St George received from Ottilie, a particularly beautiful miniature portrait of Goethe with a lock of his hair and a pair of embroidered silk slippers which Goethe had worn for one day only and which he sent him through her as 'ein kleines scherzhaftes Andenken'. According to A. v. Keller, Professor Charles Milner in Tübingen inherited these objects together with two letters of Ottilie, obviously both undated, from St George Cromie. Many years later, in 1833 and 1834, Cromie's name turns up once again in the letters of Ottilie,⁶ who since 1830 had been a widow. Writing to Adele Schopenhauer she mentions that she had a letter from Cromie, 'der mit alter Treue über meine Schreibfaulheit klagt'. A few months later Ottilie mockingly discards a suggestion obviously made by Adele

¹ *Aus Ottilie von Goethes Nachlass*, ed. W. von Oettingen in *Schriften der Goethe Gesellschaft*, xxxviii, 123.

² A. G. Alford, *Englishmen in Weimar*, Publications of the English Goethe Society, v, 191 f.

³ Weimar edition, IV, x, 189, 216, 293 f.

⁴ Eckermann, *Gespräche*, 11. Juni 1825 and

Letters to Ottilie, 4 June 1825 and to Zelter, 6 June 1825. Weimar edition, IV, xxxix, 213, 215.

⁵ *Schriften der Goethe Gesellschaft*, xxviii, 130.

⁶ Ottilie von Goethe, *Erlebnisse und Geständnisse*, ed. H. H. Houben, 1923, pp. 13 ff.

that she should marry Cromie: 'Um des Himmels willen, Adele, welch ein Gedanke—nein, da würde ich denn doch zwischen ihm und Story nicht schwanken, obgleich St George wohl meine Liebe viel mehr verdienen mag.' Whether there had been anything on Cromie's side that justified Adele's suggestion and whether perhaps already his Weimar yearnings were caused by Ottilie's absence it is impossible for us to tell. That her striking personality did arouse passionate feelings in more than one of those foreign visitors so much younger than herself her letters and diaries of the twenties amply reveal.

The Bodleian album is an interesting document of that 'post-classical' Weimar which under the benevolent eyes of the great 'Dichturfürst' still lived on its cherished traditions. What Goethe himself thought of albums can best be seen from a remark in one of his letters to Ottilie, written on 11 June 1825. He was sending her some little poems and says in a postscript: 'Noch bemerke ich daß das Gedicht zu einem Stammbuche gehört welches du nächstens erhalten wirst—oder vielmehr schon jetzt erhältst. Ohngefähr in der Hälfte des Büchleins sieht ein Zeichen hervor. Dort wünsche ich daß, hinter meine und des Kanzlers Schrift, die Freunde sich hübsch der Reihe nach einschreiben, Frommanns, Knebels und wer sonst ein gutes Wort spenden mag; denn es ist im Grunde doch artig ein Zeugnis eines so langen Zusammenbleibens aufzustellen.' So the innumerable entries in albums of which the volumes of Goethe's poems give evidence were obviously not merely not a burden to him but a thing well worth while, one of the manifestations of 'zierlich denken und süß erinnern', one of the ways by which one can 'dem Augenblick Dauer verleihn'.

Naturally the opening poem in St George Cromie's album is by Goethe. He writes in roman script:

Herren St George Cromie
dem gebildeten Jüngling,
und treuen Hausfreunde.

Eile Freunden dies zu reichen
Bitte sie um eilig Zeichen,
Eilig Zeichen daß sie lieben.
Lieben das ist bald geschrieben.
Feder aber darf nicht weilen;
Liebe will vorüber eilen.

Zu wohlwollendem

Weimar d. 5. May

Andenken

1826

Goethe

This little poem is to be found both in the Weimar edition (I, iv, 271) and in the *Jubiläumsausgabe* (III, 157) under the heading: *Zur Stammbuchs-Weihe. Meinem lieben Wölfehen* 28. Mai 1826, which date would suggest that the poem was written or at least used for the young Irishman before it was given to the little boy. But in the variants of vol. v of the Weimar edition (p. 165) the editor remarks that on the evidence of the second volume of the *Quartausgabe* (1836) the date should be altered to 28 March. It may be assumed that Riemer and Eckermann, the editors of that edition, had Wolfgang's album before them which later editors had not, for the variants of 1910 refer to four manuscripts only, one (no. 589) a draft in pencil, the other three later entries in albums, one (no. 590) of Nov. 1827, one (no. 591) Christmas 1827 and one (no. 592) June 1828. So the Oxford manuscript precedes those three entries. Like MSS. 589–592 it has 'bald geschrieben' instead of the 'schnell geschrieben' of the Weimar edition and the *Jubiläumsausgabe*. For the rest it agrees with the printed version.

On the opposite page there is an engraving of Goethe in profile by C. A. Schwerd-

geburch after Rauch's famous medal,¹ signed Rauch Bovy Schwerdgeburch. There are two more autographs of Goethe in the book. On the first and on one of the last pages are inserted printed copies of the poems in which Goethe returned thanks for congratulations on his seventieth and his seventy-fifth birthdays. Both copies are signed by the author in German script, the earlier one inserted on a back page: 'Weimar, Jun. 1826 Goethe', the other, written in August 1826, i.e. after Cromie's departure, and inserted on the very first page of the book is signed: 'Weimar Goethe.' This one is prettily printed, with a pattern round the margin.

Goethe's entry began the book, and the younger members of his family were the last of the Weimar circle to contribute. 'Am Tage Ihrer Abreise', Otilie says. In between their parents come the two little boys aged 7 and 5½, and their childish handwriting appears touchingly awkward among those of their elders. 'Ihr kleiner Freund Walther' has chosen the first stanza of 'Edel sei der Mensch', and one might think that he knew somehow what it means. But could little Wölfchen possibly know what he was saying when he wrote 'Ein unnütz Leben ist ein früher Tod'? August, in a poetic effort of his own on the transitoriness of life headed 'Dem Insel Freunde', writes: 'Das Leben gleicht dem heitren Wasser-Spiegel, Es gleicht der Welle, die von dannen eilt. . .', offering as a consolation at the end the discovery of 'Bewegung' as 'ein herrlich Element'.² Otilie gives as many as five fine and long quotations, two by Schiller, one by Moore in English (the only one that refers to Cromie's military career) and two 'Vom Vater', 'Wenn einen Menschen die Natur erhoben' and 'Wer nicht die Welt in seinen Freunden sieht'. She ends with the words: 'Wohin Ihr Schicksal Sie auch treiben mag, glauben Sie mir, Sie können nie treuere Freunde finden als die, die Ihr Andenken in Deutschland bewahren werden.'

The other writers with one or two exceptions all belong to three overlapping groups. First of all there are Goethe's own old friends. They come first in date and place, following their master at a month's distance, Knebel, von Müller, H. Meyer, Riemer, Eckermann, J. N. Hummel, the composer, and, later in the book, on the occasion of his visit to Weimar, K. F. Zelter with the characteristic entry: 'Das waren mir selige Tage!' (They were Cromie's last days in Weimar which owing to Zelter's presence seem to have been particularly festive.) The two other groups are more intimately connected with Otilie. One consists of members of the court, such as her own mother, Frau von Pogwisch, who signs herself as 'Ihre dankbare Schülerin und Freundin', her grandmother, the old Gräfin Henckel-Donnersmarck, then well-known Weimar families, the von Spiegel and von Fritsch, von Egloffstein, von Gross and von Gersdorff families, and finally the tutors at the court, Made-moiselle Pallard and Frédéric Soret. The last group is formed by Johanna Schopenhauer, the writer, her gifted daughter Adele, Otilie's most intimate friend, and a number of minor poets, actors or amateur actors, all people whom at some time or other we find in Johanna's famous salon, F. von Gerstenbergk, S. Schütze, Carl La Roche, O. L. B. Wolff, and others.³ There are, besides Dr Froriep, a few outsiders, such as B. Kuhn, probably a Professor at the Gymnasium, who wishes Cromie to remember 'die genußreichen Stunden, welche wir zusammen beim Studium von Schiller's Werken verlebten'. Not one of Cromie's young countrymen has contributed to his album.

¹ The engraving is described in H. Rollett, *Die Goethe-Bildnisse*, Wien, 1883, p. 205, as the first of the two engravings made after Rauch's medal.

² Cromie on his part also contributed to an

album of August. See *Deutsche-Rundschau*, 1891, pp. 131 ff.

³ See H. H. Houben, *Damals in Weimar. Erinnerungen und Briefe von und an Johanna Schopenhauer*, Berlin, n.d.

The general level of the entries is remarkably high. Most of the writers have chosen their literary tributes with tact and taste. Quotations from Tasso are frequent, there are some from Goethe's poems, some from Schiller, some attractive passages from Jean Paul who seems particularly popular with the younger women. The original contributions, of which there are quite a number, are of uneven value, Hummel's 'Musikalische Lebensreise (in zwei harmonischen Verwechslungen)' on the text 'Live well, die well, live well, die never, die well, live ever', stands out among them. One of the little poems may be quoted here. It is very personal and at the same time typical of the whole book. It is written by Carl von Spiegel, the Lord Marshal of the Grand Duke and husband of the beautiful Frau von Spiegel for whom Goethe wrote the poem 'Der Dichtung Faden läßt sich heut' nicht fassen'.¹

Doch wie die Stern' am Abend uns begleiten,
Und morgens früh als Führer von uns ziehn,
So scheint auch das was sonst in dunklen Weiten
Ein schwindend Licht der Heimat ihm erschien,
Ihn freundlich jetzt zum künft'gen Glück zu leiten,
Und wie ein Kranz am schönen Ziel zu blühen.
Der ist beglückt, wem ewig unveraltet
Erinnerung stets zur Hoffnung sich gestaltet.

The most attractive of all, because it throws some light on the young Irishman's character and because in itself it is delicate and poetic, is the fable 'Le Gland et le Lac' which Frédéric Soret wrote for his young friend. In an introduction in which he speaks of how a cloud passing the sun can suddenly fill the whole scenery with sadness he turns to his friend saying:

Ainsi je vous ai vu d'un excès de gaîté
Passer au désespoir, des pleurs à la tendresse
Et souvent pour bien peu vous agiter beaucoup.

This has made him remember a long-forgotten scene which he presents in the form of a little allegory about an acorn which, falling from the proud oak tree, suddenly destroys the idyllic beauty and serene peace of the lovely countryside reflected in the stillness of the lake. He ends up by referring to the instability of all our happiness, 'Un mot peut la troubler et rembrunir le cœur'.

There rings through the whole book a note of warmth and sincerity which gives it its charm, and, moreover, there is in almost all the writers a consciousness that they stand for a great and noble heritage. Caroline von Egloffstein writes:

Klein und niedrig zwar nur sind deine Ufer, Jlmee!
Aber du hörtest im Lauf manches unsterbliche Lied.

The book is of small quarto size, good thick paper with red leather covers on which a delicate gold pattern and the name of its owner are stencilled. It also contains some Weimar engravings and one later entry, a piece of rather frivolous music by one Richard Myham, Carlisle, 18 November 1835.

The album, together with the wallet, was given to the Bodleian by the Hon. Mrs Rollo Russell of Steap, Hampshire. In an accompanying letter she tells how she found it in the neglected library of Renoyle House, Renoyle, Galway, and how she acquired it from old Mrs Blake to whose family the objects had been given by St George Cromie's brother after his death in memory of him.

ELISABETH BLOCHMANN

OXFORD

¹ *Jubiläumsausgabe*, III, 20, 292.

ANCIENT LITERATURE IN RUSSIAN TRANSLATIONS

Russians have always shown an interest in ancient art, theatre, science and literature. Many features of Russian architecture may be traced back to classical architectural forms, which are embodied in magnificent buildings in Moscow and Leningrad; the appreciation and study of the sculpture of ancient Hellas influenced the works of the great Russian artists Alexander Ivanov and Ilya Repin. The poetry and imaginative prose, the art of rhetoric and the historical writings, of the ancient Greeks and Romans have always been well known in Russia. In the past twenty-five years, the growing interest among wide circles of readers and the changed criteria of artistic translation have brought about the appearance of numerous new Soviet editions of ancient authors.

In the years between 1917 and 1942 the heritage of antiquity has been both more widely popularized and the subject of more profound study. Homer's epics have been republished in the translations of N. Gnedich and V. Zhukovsky, which have long been regarded as classics in their own right. For many years the well-known Russian writer, V. Veresayev-Smidovich, has been working on new translations of the classical epics.

The Greek theatre has enjoyed special attention in the Soviet Union. The tragedies of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides have been published in new popular and academic editions. The comedies of Aristophanes and Menander have come out in new translations, and some of them, as, for instance, *Lysistrata*, have been included in the repertory of Soviet theatres.

The late Hellenic romance *Daphnis and Chloe* by Longus, previously known in Russia in a translation by the decadent writer Dmitri Merezhkovsky, has been issued in a new translation by S. P. Kondratyev, which more exactly and closely reproduces the lyrical quality of this pastoral tale. The *Aethiopica* of Heliodorus, which exerted an obvious and comprehensive influence upon later literary tradition, has appeared in a new translation by A. Egunov.

The Greek orators Lysias and Demosthenes, and the Greek and Roman philosophers and historians—Aristotle, Plato, Tacitus and others—have been published in excellent translations with critical introductions and notes by Sergei Sobolevsky, eminent Russian philologist and corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., Professor Sergei Ratzil, A. Kubitsky, A. Neussypin and others.

The approximate rendition of Vergil in pre-revolutionary editions has been replaced by the new excellent translation of the *Aeneid* by that refined and exacting poet Valeri Bryusov, with the co-operation of Sergei Solovyov. Vergil's *Bucolics* and *Georgics* have been published in a splendid translation by S. Shervinsky. Horace, Martial and Juvenal have likewise been aptly translated. Lucretius's philosophical poem *On Nature* has been issued in a painstaking translation with commentaries by F. Petrovsky. Apuleius's *The Golden Ass* is now available in Russian in an excellent translation by Mikhail Kuzmin. The comedies of Plautus and Terence have been translated by A. Artyushkov and Seneca's tragedies by Sergei Solovyov.

The above is a far from complete summary of the work accomplished in the sphere of bringing the classical heritage to the large Russian reading public. This work is being continued during the present war. It is done by writers and philologists both of the older generation and their pupils of the younger generation who are enthusiastically and devotedly continuing the work of their teachers.

DMITRI MIKHALCHIK

Moscow

REVIEWS

The Nature of Literature: its Relation to Science, Language and Human Experience.

By THOMAS CLARK POLLOCK. Princeton: Princeton University Press; London: H. Milford. 1942. xxiv + 218 pp. 20s.

Students of literature may spare themselves some disappointment over Mr Pollock's book if they make certain allowances. To begin with, the repetitive and diffuse style will irritate them unduly unless they notice that it comes partly at least from a sustained effort at scientific precision (modern books especially on the newer sciences throw a strange light on our ideas about the development of prose in the seventeenth century), and from the detailed analysis of processes usually taken for granted and summarily described. The title, moreover, is misleading; the subject is in fact the nature of language, and a relatively small part of the book deals with the specifically literary uses of words.

Starting from a psychological account of symbolism and of the ways in which the symbols we call words acquire meaning through association with a series of experiences, Mr Pollock defines the growth of language as a journey from the concreteness and particularity of an accompanying situation towards the ever-increasing abstraction of science, whose aim is to describe, not merely something no longer actually present, but even something never present in the particular situation at all, the generalization. The savage has one word for five oranges and another (unrelated) for five bananas. The developed language has neither: it has words like *five* and *fruit*, representing what no man ever sees. Here is the essential difference between the ordinary (and scientific) and the 'literary' uses of words: the first points to relations between abstractions from experiences, the second evokes the unique experiences themselves. The central chapter discusses some of the evocative qualities (sound, association, omission, order, hypnosis, expectation, etc.) which enable language to induce and control experience, with some interesting experimental illustrations.

Mr Pollock's contribution to our study is the clarity and cogency of his classification. He has helped to sharpen that distinction of which the nineteenth century became increasingly aware, and which De Quincey expressed in 'literature of knowledge' and 'literature of power'. His attack on the prevailing worship of scientific method and the snobbery about the superior 'truth' of abstract language, is welcome; and so also is his attempt to banish the narrowing words 'emotion' and 'idea' from our talk about the content of literature.

Outside these limits, however, there appears a serious weakness in Mr Pollock's position. It is seen already in his effort to divide sharply literature, which expresses and evokes experiences, from 'pseudo-literature', which merely evokes. A cynical writer may, certainly, manipulate his material with his eye coolly on a profitable public; but the assumption that real literature can only begin from an original experience, separate from words, is a large one—and one which the psychologist is peculiarly liable to make. For him it is absurd to 'reify' words, to attribute to words a life of their own. His interest is in mental events, and words are dead and arbitrary signs for these. But poets have never thought so. Poets have loved words as they would a mistress, and their poetry has often been born (as in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries) from their delight in the splendour and subtlety of language. The poet's 'experience' may be, not a tree or a sunset, but a phrase, a melody, a story, even a literary form. The worst error, surely, in talking of art is to imply that its medium is an accident or a convenience, that a writer happens to use words to express an experience which he might have conveyed otherwise had he chosen. Abstract language is not exhaustive; many elements of

the situation escape; thinking and feeling go on unreflected in what is said. Mr Pollock deprecates 'creative' as a description of literary language because it is not definitive; but surely literature is experience with precisely this distinguishing mark, that all of it is somehow caught up in words—experience which does not go in search of verbal patterns as the matter of science does, but which is helped to birth by them. Psychologists have still to explain why certain highly individual experiences should, so to speak, live themselves out in the publicly acceptable terms characteristic of good art.

The full consequences of this position come out in Mr Pollock's Postscript. There we learn that since literature evokes experiences the evaluation of works of literature consists simply in applying the 'socio-ethical' standards appropriate to any other experience. This involves us in complete relativism; *Hamlet* and the *Divina Commedia* may be paltry or great according to the 'needs' of a reader or a society at a particular moment. And since the chief interest is in the reader and his erratic responses, the value of historical study, which might cramp these responses by discovering the original value of the elements in the work, is belittled. The difficulty in the end is the result of ignoring entirely the relevant distinction between 'literary' and non-literary experiences: the latter are (if healthy) intimately bound up with action, and must be judged by standards of efficiency (in the widest sense), while the former (if proper) are free from this necessity. It is strange that Max Eastman's treatment of this point, crucial in the history of literary theory, is not referred to here.

J. C. BRYCE

GLASGOW

The Place-Names of Cambridgeshire and the Isle of Ely. By P. H. REANEY. (English Place-Name Society, vol. XIX.) Cambridge: University Press. 1943. lxi+396 pp. 23s. 6d.

This volume maintains that high standard of efficiency which one associates with the publications of the English Place-Name Society and in scope and pattern it conforms to the previous volumes of the Survey and in particular to the author's earlier book (1935) on the larger county of Essex. It comprises the usual supplements on Place-Name Elements, Personal Names, Feudal and Manorial Names, and Field and Minor Names; and in a pocket at the end it contains the customary maps of the hundreds and parishes, and of the distribution of certain name-forming suffixes. The Introduction is likewise a most valuable summary of the more general conclusions reached by Dr Reaney after many years of investigation and its sixteen pages of well-marshalled information are of great interest to archaeologists, historians, geographers and philologists alike. The author agrees with R. H. Hodgkin that the Anglo-Saxon invaders probably entered the Fenlands by the Wash near Wisbech, and he corroborates the statements made by H. C. Darby and J. N. L. Myres that the fens had not always been so desolate and so inhospitable as in Anglo-Saxon times. Many villages flourished in this part of Roman Britain. It was towards the end of the third century that living conditions deteriorated. A slight subsidence may have occurred in the whole fenland basin or there may have been a breach in the natural silt embankment round the southern shores of the Wash.

It may be noted that there is a slight discrepancy between the assertion in the Introduction (p. xviii) that *dung*, compounded in Wilsmere Down near Barrington, 'is never found in Anglo-Saxon literature' and the statement in the elucidation of the name (p. 72) that this element is 'recorded once in OE poetry'. Now this unique appearance is in Andreas 1270, 'tō þære dimman ding', 'to the dark prison', where *ding* for **dyng* is putatively the dat. sing. of the fem. monosyllabic stem

**dung* which, hitherto on the evidence of this passage alone, has found a place in grammars and dictionaries. Its relationship with OHG *tung* and MHG *tunc*, 'underground chamber where women did their weaving', seems to be well established (Walde-Pokorny s.v. *dhengh-*), and its semantic development from 'chamber covered in winter with *dung* to keep out the cold', however unattractive, is fairly certain.

Whatever may be the alternative name of the River Cam to-day, it should be made clear (pp. 6, 37) that the form of the nominative (weak fem.) in Old English was *Grante* rather than *Granta*.

That the name Croydon, from *crāwe* + *denu*, 'valley frequented by crows', shows 'the same irregular development which [*sic*] we find in *Croyland* for *Crowland* (L)' (p. 53) is erroneous. The first element in the Lincolnshire *Crowland* was not *crāwe* but **crūw*, *crūg*, presumably meaning 'bend', well attested by such eighth-century forms as Cruglond, Cruwland, in the Latin *Life of Saint Guthlac* by Felix, and elsewhere. The modern pronunciations of this Lincolnshire name as [*kroulənd*] and [*kroilənd*] are indeed both 'irregular' since the normal phonological development would be [*kraulənd*]. On the other hand, the first element of the Somersetshire Croydon (Hill), from *crāwe* + *dūn*, does show an 'irregular' development similar to the Cambridge Croydon and this name might therefore have been cited as a parallel.

In Chilford Hundred the modern names Holmstead Hall and Olmstead Green, as compared with the thirteenth-century *Elm(e)sted(e)* forms, are very instructive (p. 102), testifying as they do to an Old English *ulm* as in *ulm-trēow* side by side with *elm*, even as unmutated *bōc* (as in *bōc-trēow* side by side with *bēce*) survives in the Surrey Bookham, 'village by beeches', as against the not distant Beech Hill in Berkshire. The earliest recorded forms of (H)olmstead are *Halmstede* and *Almystede* and they are quite conceivably 'due to French influence', but we should like to think that these are genuine *alm* forms from Old Norse *almr* and that they are comparable to other significant hybrids in this county with Scandinavian first elements (p. 306) like Clintway, Conington and Flegcroft.

In explaining *Saxton* (*Hall*) and *Saxon* (*Street*) as 'Saxon farm' (p. 128) 'we should have expected ME forms *Saxeton*, *Saxeham*, deriving from OE *Seaxatūn* and *Seaxahām* (with gen. pl. *Seaxa*), rather than *Saxton* and *Saxham* going back apparently to OE *Seaxtūn* and *Seaxhām*'. An outstanding example of this direct compounding of *Seax-* with another element is OE *Se(a)xlānd* 'England' (E. Tengstrand, *A Contribution to the Study of Genitival Composition in Old English Place-Names*, p. 21 n.).

Madingley, 'wood or clearing of the people of Māda' (p. 181), is the only name in the county in *-ingley*, OE *-inga* + *lēah*. That its first element derives from an unrecorded name *Mada* is highly probable, but that this *Mada* is 'a nickname derived from OE *mād*, "foolish"', as already suggested by Ekwall, is not very acceptable. In any case, OE *mād*, adj., is hypothetical. *Gemād* appears once in the Corpus Glossary, 'vecors, gemaad', and perhaps the compound *mādmōd*, 'folly', was intended by the poet at l. 25 of '*Bi Manna Mōd*' ('*ungemedede mādmōd*') though most scholars would now prefer to follow Mackie in taking the *mad* as a mere participial termination and in reading '*ungemedemad mōd*'. Certainly Modern English '*mad*' derives not from the adjective but from OE *gemædded* (*gemædd*, *gemæd*), p.p. of *gemædan*. More probably, therefore, *Mada* may be regarded as a hypocoristic form of some such name as *Madselm*.

The interpretation of Snailwell from OE *snægel-wielle* as snail-like or 'sluggish stream' (p. 196), rather than as 'stream frequented by snails' (Ekwall), is fanciful. The author, we suspect, has been (perhaps unwittingly) influenced by E. Conybeare's description in *Highways and Byways in Cambridge* of this stream which 'crawls away into the adjacent fen'.

By a curious oversight, one or two words like *æġl*, *blāc*, *hunig* and *sceolh* appear

in the List of Elements (pp. 299-306) with (*n*) to denote that they are not included in *The Chief Elements used in English Place-Names*, that indispensable prelude to the Society's survey by counties. The reader, if undeterred, will find them there all the same, with translation, comment and illustrations.

It was the late Sir Allen Mawer's own suggestion that this book should be dedicated to the memory of his revered master, Walter William Skeat, who published his *Place-Names of Cambridgeshire* just over forty years ago and who therein laid down the fundamental principles of place-name study. The book before us is concerned with over two thousand names, apart from field-names, compared with less than two hundred names explained by Skeat. Neither finality nor infallibility was claimed by Skeat and yet most of his elucidations have survived the searching tests applied by Reaney, who pays generous tribute to his predecessor's insight and erudition.

SIMEON POTTER

SOUTHAMPTON

Cynewulf and the Cynewulf Canon. By SATYENDRA KUMAR DAS. Calcutta University Press. 1942. xx+259 pp. Rs. 5.

This painstaking and useful monograph seeks, once for all, to settle the question of the Cynewulf canon by a scientific and literary investigation of a carefully planned, restricted and exact kind. Dr Das rigidly excludes all other questions of Cynewulf's life and work, save only that of the establishment of his authentic canon: and this is sought to be done by a thorough comparison between the 'signed' and the 'unsigned' poems by means of tests which are (*a*) metrical, and (*b*) stylistic.

The work is, accordingly, divided into two sections. The first consists of the metrical investigation, in which Sievers's 'five types' scheme is applied, type by type, to the 'signed' and the 'unsigned' poems. The 'unsigned' pieces investigated are the two sections of *Crist* not containing runes (first and last), the two parts of *Gufþlac*, the *Andreas*, *The Phoenix*, *The Dream of the Rood*, and the *Riddles*. The result of this full examination is to establish certain characteristics of metre as clearly distinguishing the four poems which have the name Cynewulf in runes within them, and to make it appear that these well-marked characteristics are not found to any appreciable extent in the 'unsigned' poems, which show other and different metrical habits of their own. Dr Das would even question the propriety of such expressions as 'School of Cynewulf' or *Kynewulfkreis*, since he finds the four 'signed' poems to form a quite distinctive group in themselves.

The second section of the book examines again the two categories of poems, under the heads of (*a*) style, and (*b*) 'literary criticism'. The marked tendency of Cynewulf to reflect, to idealize and to seek a deeper meaning in the events he narrates than is usual in the more direct style of earlier Old English poetry, seems to Dr Das again clearly to show itself in the 'signed' poems and to be absent from the others investigated. Both the metrical and the stylistic and literary examinations lead Dr Das to conclude definitely that 'None except the four signed poems can have been the work of Cynewulf': and he also is enthusiastically of opinion that Cynewulf's poems as thus delimited show 'a far higher level of poetic inspiration than... the other poets with whose works we have had to deal, that Cynewulf's works... bear the marks of the highest order of artistic workmanship'.

The section on metrical investigation, with its close factual statistical argument, is the more valuable of the two. For here Dr Das presents his full material clearly and laboriously, and no one is likely, after working through his facts, to dispute the conclusion arrived at. That this book should aim at combining aesthetic appreciation of Cynewulf with a scientific presentation of the facts is all to the

good—and is something rarely to be found in the equally scientific German works which have evidently been the author's intimate companions for long. But the English reader will find Dr Das at times diffuse and overmetaphorical in his use of language, and may think that the Indian scholar has read into his beloved Cynewulf a more profound art and philosophy than a reader with a merely European background can discern. Yet Cynewulf has, as Dr Das points out, been much neglected from the purely literary standpoint; and in emphasizing his undoubted artistic merits and seeking to arouse a real literary appreciation of Cynewulf, the author of this book is performing a real service to Old English studies.

The book has no index or bibliography, though the notes at the end supply references in plenty. Sometimes technical terms are used oddly, and in the metrical section there seems to be confusion between quantity and weight of syllable, as for instance when (pp. 125-6) the first syllable of the O.E. word *fæder* is described as 'long' when what is probably meant is that it bears the metrical *lift* or 'Hebung'. There are also misprints of various kinds, though nothing of importance.

Dr Das has done a useful piece of work which should settle scholars more firmly in the view which has for some time been gaining ground that Cynewulf's works are limited to the four 'signed poems'. The section on style and literary criticism will stimulate interest and may lead others to take up the subject from the artistic point of view; and the work on metre may—within its limits—be accepted as definitive.

C. L. WRENN

LONDON

The Poetical Dialogues of Solomon and Saturn. Edited by ROBERT J. MENNER. New York: The Modern Language Association of America; London: Oxford University Press. 1942. xi + 176 pp. 12s.

This is a distinguished and much-needed edition of what is probably the most puzzling, and at the same time the most tantalizingly fascinating of all Old English texts. Not since Kemble, to whose pioneer learning just tribute is here paid, has anything like a full edition been attempted: and since 1848 much has come to light to enable the present editor to satisfy the needs of the many specialist students to whom the two poetical dialogues and the prose dialogue of Solomon and Saturn make their appeal. For alike the philologist, the folklorist, the runologist and the student of cultural history—to mention only a few of the workers to whom Professor Menner offers the fruits of his study—will be amply rewarded by a close study of these texts in the light of the full apparatus here offered.

Besides a very full commentary and a workmanlike glossary which is convenient for quick reading, Professor Menner has, in his elaborate introduction, dealt in a masterly way with all that can be required for the study of the texts by the educated general student of English literature as well as by the specialist. There is an excellent bibliography.

Professor Menner will earn special gratitude for his work on the background to the legends and on their affinities and analogues: and while sensitive literary appreciation is not lacking where it is called for (as in some passages of Poem II), the language of the texts is examined with a discerning thoroughness that is rare indeed. New light is thrown on many obscure matters, and something like finality seems to have been reached on some of the more controversial points, such as the date of composition.

It is a pity that, because of an earlier idea of making the edition suitable for College students (for whom it is inherently unfitting) the editor has followed the practice of indicating the quantities of long vowels. For those who will use this book profitably will be far from beginners, and they would doubtless rather have

had the MS. accents—always of interest to specialists—which this learned edition omits. It is, too, to be regretted, that it was not found possible in these difficult times for Professor Menner himself to work with the MSS., but that photostats, supplemented with readings and transcriptions made by another scholar, had perforce to serve throughout.

Altogether, as those who know Professor Menner's always accurate and scholarly work would expect, this is an edition of outstanding quality, which may be said to combine in many ways the special virtues of both Kemble and Sweet.

C. L. WRENN

LONDON

The Elizabethan World Picture. By E. M. W. TILLYARD. London: Chatto and Windus. 1943. viii+108 pp. 6s.

Mr Tillyard's main theme is that the picture of the world which the Elizabethans accepted as a background to all their thought was still medieval. It was with the same purpose that, as recently as 1905, there was published *Mediaeval Lore from Bartholomew Anglicus* (one of the chief sources of such information), with a view 'to aid the English of the twentieth century to understand better their national literature of the age of Elizabeth: Shakspeare, Jonson, Spenser, Marlowe, Massinger, Lyly, Drayton, etc., all of them nourished on the *De proprietatibus* and drawing from this work (or its derivatives) their conceits about the things of earth and heaven:

Talking of stones, stars, plants, of fishes, flies;
Playing with words and idle similes.'

The interest of Mr Tillyard's restatement is the opportunity it gives to compare with the fuller studies of Mr Basil Willey on the background of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. An essay by the same writer in *The New Criterion*, on the background to Wordsworth's poetry, makes one hope that he may go on to give us a similar work on the changing background of the nineteenth century. If Copernicus had already begun to disturb the picture which Mr Tillyard presents:

new philosophy calls all in doubt,
The element of fire is quite put out;
The sun is lost, and th' earth, and no man's wit
Can well direct him where to look for it,

the geologists and Darwin were to do so still more before the nineteenth century was very old. But in the age of Elizabeth, despite Copernicus, 'the ordinary educated Elizabethan thought of the universe as geocentric'. It was Newton's discoveries which so powerfully affected the imagination, to judge by the letters of Voltaire, that this picture began not only to disintegrate but to give place to another which was to find expression in Thomson's *Seasons*:

Newton, pure intelligence, whom God
To mortals lent to trace his boundless works
From laws sublimely simple.

Darwin was to give a rude shock to a more passionately held doctrine, the paramount position of man among animals.

The Elizabethan picture as Mr Tillyard represents it is dominated by the conception of law, order, hierarchy, disturbed by the Fall of man, the intrusion of sin: 'disproportioned sin' which

Jarr'd against nature's chime, and with harsh din
Broke the fair music that all creatures made
To their great Lord, whose love their motion sway'd
In perfect diapason while they stood
In first obedience and their state of good.

Order is the essential factor alike in the universe of things and in the social life of men: see the quotations from Shakespeare, Raleigh, Hooker, Spenser, etc. (pp. 2-15), 'see we not plainly that obedience of creatures unto the law of nature is the stay of the whole world' (Hooker). The effect of the Fall, of Sin, on man and human society, was obvious. About its effect on the world of things there was apparently some uncertainty or divergence of view. Milton states distinctly one view, that everything has gone somewhat wrong:

At that tasted fruit
The sun as from Thyestean banquet, turn'd
His course intended; else how had the world
Inhabited, though sinless, more than now
Avoided pinching cold and scorching heat.

.

but Discord first,
Daughter of Sin, among the irrational,
Death introduc'd through fierce antipathy:
Beast now with beast 'gan war, and fowl with fowl,
And fish with fish &c.

Nevertheless, the Chain of Being as represented in the quotations by Mr Tillyard is of an ordered hierarchy throughout which might, and should, be an example to man. Indeed in the hierarchy of animals, fishes, birds and beasts (p. 27), the supremacy in each kind is given (excepting the flowers) to just those which are most destructive, most authoritarian, the dolphin, the eagle, the lion. The fullness and hierarchy of being which Mr Tillyard illustrates from Spenser's *Garden of Adonis* (p. 29):

Daily they grow and daily forth are sent
Into the world it to replenish more;
Yet is the stock not lessened nor spent
But still remains in everlasting store
As it at first created was of yore,

has a characteristically curious support from Donne who tells us that in the opinion of some divines, if we *could* destroy one whole species it would be sin to do so. And that some kinds *have* disappeared was later one reason why to Voltaire this Chain of Created Beings which, when he first came on it in Plato, filled him with admiration, vanished 'comme autrefois toutes les apparitions s'en fuyaient le matin au chant du coque'. But the belief or opinion outlasted the Elizabethan age. It was held by John Wesley. Indeed, one may ask, if we apprehend the idea of space-time, rather than of space and time as separate entities, whether modern science has not the same conception of a complete universe causally held together, if not so clear about the hierarchy, the order of precedence.

But the idea of order, hierarchy, was predominant in the Middle Ages and, so Mr Tillyard contends, in the Elizabethan age. For the special interest of his book is not the details with which he fills up the general scheme, the links in the chain of being, for these are familiar to any student of the background to Chaucer and medieval literature. His special duty is to show us how, and how far, these are still dominant in the sixteenth century. Of the importance of hierarchy in the universe and in human society the Elizabethans had no doubt, as the passages here cited from Hooker, Shakespeare, Spenser, Raleigh, etc. prove.

In the seventeenth century both the progress of scientific thought and discovery, and the troubled course of politics, were to disturb this deep vein of sentiment. Yet even in Milton, at least in *Paradise Lost*, Mr Lewis has shown that this idea of hierarchy is the hinge on which the whole turns. But coming again on Hooker, if only in the extracts here, one is made to feel what it was that Milton failed to

convey in his dramatic presentation of the Deity. He failed to make a reader feel the difference, on which Burke laid such stress in his Indian speeches, the difference between absolute authority and arbitrary power. By choosing to introduce or include the Deity among the *dramatis personae* of his poem, as Dante and Vondel did *not*, Milton gave to the absolute power of God, which we recognize in the laws of Nature without and the moral law within, the appearance of an almost dreadful arbitrariness alike in his dealings with the angels and with poor humanity. But of that elsewhere.

Coming to details, Mr Tillyard shows us that 'the Elizabethans pictured the universal order under three main forms—a chain of being, a series of corresponding planes, and a dance'. In the links of the chain he includes angels and ether, the stars and Fortune, the Elements, Man and his position as the nodal point 'binding together *all* creation, bridging the greatest cosmic chasm, that between matter and spirit', his physical and his mental constitution, and finally animals, plants and metals. In their conception of each of these the Elizabethans are still medievals. One would like to know whether they made any modifications, any omissions, or alterations of emphasis. It was the first of these that was to disintegrate in the course of the next century. Spenser could still in the *Hymn of Heavenly Beauty* look up to a Heaven that was Heaven, quite other in constitution to this world of the four elements. With the Moon their sway ended. Beyond was the realm of the heavenly bodies:

The house of blessed gods which men call SKYE,

consisting of the fifth element free from generation and destruction, from change of quality or size, and moving not like the terrestrial elements in straight lines but in a circle. It was this which the Copernicans and finally Newton were to dispel. This was the realm of ether or fire, pure or real fire, for Heavenly fire is not our fire, as Bacon tells us. It is true fire which 'with them is durable and consistent and in its natural place but with us is a stranger and momentary and impure: like Vulcan that halted with his fall'. It is of this ether or fire that angels possess bodies, Mr Tillyard says but gives no source. In appearing to men they must assume, Aquinas tells us, a body of one of the earthly elements. Earth and water are excluded because they could not then disappear as quickly as they do; and so fire because then they would destroy whatever they touched. It must therefore be of air, such thickened air as we see in clouds on the tops of hills. Hence Milton's sneer at 'mist the theologians' gloss'. But in the same hymn by Spenser one can see some of the medieval steps in the ladder which Protestants have dropped. There are angels and archangels but no Virgin Mother nor Saints. The fullness of Donne's Catholic upbringing is seen when in his Litany, *after* The Trinity and *above* the Angels, comes The Virgin Mary:

For that faire blessed Mother-maid,
Whose flesh redem'd us; that she-Cherubin

Our zealous thanks we pour. As her deeds were
Our helpes, so are her prayers; nor can she sue
In vaine who hath such titles unto you.

Under the heading 'Man' Mr Tillyard follows closely the medieval conception of his complex being, physical and mental—the body with its balance of humours which may be disturbed by an excess of heat or cold or moist or dry; his understanding differing from the angelic intuitive power, dependent on the 'painful use of the discursive reason' (p. 65). 'What marks man from angel and beast is his power of learning... Hence it was that the learning of a Sidney or a Donne or

a Milton was an ethical and religious matter. To learn was to exercise one of the great human prerogatives.' And the chief thing is to learn to know oneself:

Seek we then ourselves in ourselves; for as
Men force the sun with much more force to pass
By gathering his beams with a crystal glass;
So we, if we into ourselves will turn
Blowing our sparks of virtue, may outburn
The straw which doth about our hearts sojourn.

Man's soul is threefold, a soul of growth, of sense, and of intelligence:

But as our souls of growth, and souls of sense
Have birthright of our reason's soul, yet hence
They fly not from that nor seek precedence.

Man may therefore abandon himself to the life of sense or he may choose to live the life of intelligence, rising thereby to become one of the sons of God. The passage which is quoted at p. 62 from the *Courtier's Academy* (p. 62) is related by Mr Tillyard to the passage he quotes from the Life of Pythagoras by Photius. It reads also like a free translation from the Fourth Book of the Third Ennead of Plotinus. For the Elizabethan as for Milton later the great thing for man is to make reason gain the upper hand of passion: 'The Elizabethans were interested in the nature of man with a fierceness rarely paralleled in other ages, etc.' (p. 70). Tillyard illustrates from the tragedies of Shakespeare. In his comment on Donne's *Ecstasy* I cannot quite catch where he has corrected or supplemented what I said about that poem in my edition taken with the later note on a letter *To the Countess of Bedford* (I, 95 and II, 161). As in love so in the life after death body and soul are complementary, each incomplete without the other.

I need not follow Mr Tillyard through the chapters on correspondences, to the various aspects of our old friends the macrocosm and microcosm, nor on the linking of Sir John Davies's *Orchestra* with other suggestions of music and dance in the ordering of the universe. Even the puritan Milton will allow the glorified saints to dance, however dangerous for fallen mortals. I would rather say a word on the Epilogue. The burden of his summing up is that 'the real Elizabethan age—the quarter century from 1580 to 1605—was after all the great age. Recent attempts to shift the centre of new creative energy to the Metaphysical poets, though intelligible, will not really do. They are like exalting the age of Euripides over that of Aeschylus, or the Perpendicular style of architecture over the Early English. We can estimate the eminence of Elizabethan writers by the earnestness and the passion and the assurance with which they surveyed the range of this universe.' It is this, Mr Tillyard seems to think, which gives Spenser, Sidney, Raleigh, Hooker, Shakespeare, Jonson, and Milton who 'against unbelievable odds prolongs their spirit in a later age', their superiority over Donne and later poets. But it is not the whole truth to say or suggest that this superiority—if we grant it—is due simply to the passion and assurance with which they surveyed their universe. It is due to the fact that the universe as they surveyed it was still largely and mainly the creation of the imagination—of Plato, the Neo-Platonists enriched by Christian imaginings. I ventured to say long ago, speaking of Dante's universe: 'Human nature will probably never contemplate itself against a background at once so majestic and so centred in man and his destiny, as was fashioned by the Medieval Church'. It was an imagined universe, not the product of scientific investigation. We are brought up against Macaulay's statement that 'as civilization advances poetry almost necessarily declines', to a conclusion (if we say 'science' rather than 'civilization') to which both Mr Tillyard and Mr Willey seem to incline. We shall not discuss it, but content ourselves with maintaining that, if not so great as those

for whom the universe presents no enigma, experience shows that men are drawn with a positive interest to poets who, refusing to believe what has ceased to be believable, have, like Euripides, Lucretius, Donne, Arnold and say Thomas Hardy, expressed with power the reactions of the human imagination and heart to the consciousness of disintegration, or have, like Wordsworth and Shelley, tried to fashion fresh dreams of a world to which humanity can reconcile itself.¹ At the moment science seems likely to destroy not poetry only, but civilization.

H. J. C. GRIERSON

EDINBURGH

George Whetstone Mid-Elizabethan Gentleman of Letters. By THOMAS C. IZARD. New York: Columbia University Press; London: H. Milford. 1942. ix + 297 pp. 25s.

This is the first full-length study of George Whetstone. His *Promos and Cassandra* has received some attention as a possible source for *Measure for Measure*, *An Heptameron of Civill Discourses* has obtained a few pages in studies of sixteenth-century courtesy books and his other works score a sentence or two in their appropriate places in histories of English literature. So little is known of George Whetstone's life and personality that Dr Izard has not been able to relate his development as a writer with any certainty to biographical data. Instead his book, with the exception of the first chapter, illuminates a paragraph in the *Short-Title Catalogue* which has hitherto meant little to many scholars because of the limited editions, where they exist at all, of reprints of Whetstone's works. To be really valuable, a gloss of this kind must be complete. I do not quarrel with Dr Izard for using reprints instead of original texts where the former are available—though perusal of the original editions might have revealed some interesting variants comparable to those already remarked by Hazlitt and J. Payne Collier. The war is doubtless to blame for making access to copies in Great Britain impossible—though I note that a photostatic reproduction of *A Mirour for Magistrates of Cyties* was obtained from the British Museum. But I feel that greater use might have been made of the library resources of the U.S.A. The H. E. Huntington Library, California, in particular has a very full collection of Whetstone's writings. Dr Izard used a filmed reproduction of the Huntington library copy of *An Heptameron*: I wish that instead of quoting the title from Hazlitt's *Handbook*, he had examined the Huntington copy of the 1593 reissue entitled *Aurelia*. Similarly, a photostat of the Huntington Library copy of *The Honourable Reputation of a Soldier* (1585) was used for this study, but Dr Izard relies on Hazlitt's *Handbook* for his account of the version in English and Dutch published at Leyden a year later, although the Huntington Library has a copy of this edition also. In view of the difficulty of getting hold of Whetstone's works, there is no doubt that the summaries of their contents in this study will prove most useful. Combined with the material on sources they make the best possible substitute for an annotated edition of the works themselves. Elizabethan scholars should be particularly interested in the close parallels (some of the material is relegated to an appendix) between Whetstone's works and passages in the two French versions of Pedro Mexia's *Silva de*

¹ In a recent paper (*ELH*, v, No. 4, December 1938) Theodore Spencer after indicating, as the three great disintegrators, Copernicus in the heavens, Machiavelli in the state, and Montaigne as regards man's claim to superiority in the animal world, maintains that in *Hamlet* 'an awareness of the difference between appearance and reality, based on the fact that there was a deep conflict in the contemporary views of man and his world, is woven into the text of the play,

and is largely responsible for the enormous size which characterizes *Hamlet* over any of its predecessors. Not that Shakespeare deliberately reflects the Copernican system, or the ideas of Machiavelli or Montaigne.... The split they illustrate was merely a part of Shakespeare's emotional climate; many sensitive minds were aware of it; he alone turned it to full dramatic use'; and he goes on to expound.

varia lección, *Les Diverses Leçons d'Antoine du Verdier S de Vaupriuz, suyans celles de Pierre Messie* (1577) and Claude Gruget's *Diverses Leçons de Pierre Messie* (1561). In *The English Myrror* (1586) Whetstone recounted the tale of Tamburlaine from Chapter XII of Gruget's book, giving several of the vivid details which appear in Marlowe's play. Although Gruget has been considered as a possible source for *Tamburlaine*, Whetstone's version has been overlooked hitherto.

On the whole the estimate of Whetstone is just, and discriminating in such statements as that *The Honourable Reputation of a Soldier* is unique among military handbooks of the day in dealing with the moral conduct of a soldier. Dr Izard compares Steele's *Christian Hero*. In the search for Italian stories from Bandello, Belleforest, Painter, etc., I think that the influence of Gascoigne's *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* is underestimated. The dolorous discourses and triumphs of Whetstone's Dom Diego and Paulus Plasmus in *The Rocke of Regard* were surely modelled on those of Gascoigne's Dan Bartholomew of Bathe. In discussing Whetstone's six verse elegies, Dr Izard quotes Donald A. Stauffer's statement in *English Biography before 1700* that George Whetstone might reasonably be considered the first professional biographer in England. The relation of this type of commemorative elegy to biography is misleading. Far more pertinent is the passage on the 'oration demonstrative' quoted from Thomas Wilson's *The Arte of Rhetorique*, which prescribes the contents and form of just such remembrances as Whetstone wrote.

In the first chapter of this study the scanty facts with regard to Whetstone's life are assembled. Dr Izard shows that as Whetstone's father married twice 1544(?) is as plausible a date for George's birth as 1551(?). He rejects the suggestion that Whetstone went to the Low Countries in 1572 but favours the hypothesis that Whetstone was a member of one of the Inns. There is a spirited account of the expedition under Sir Humphrey Gilbert in 1578. At the end of *A Touchstone for the Time* (1584) Whetstone stated that 'after three yeares & more of costly sute my greuous oppression (God be therfore prayesd) hath pearced the inclining eares, of the right Honourable and Gracious Judge, the L. Chancellor of Englande: by whose wisdom & graue iudgement, I constantly beleue to be releued & released of the toile of Law'. Dr Izard comments that contemporary records now available shed little if any light on this litigation and quotes one or two warrants against the heirs of Robert Whetstone published in *Feet of Fines of the Tudor Period*, Vol. II, Part I (Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Record Series). This litigation must have left its traces in the Chancery Proceedings. Although it is true that the documents are not now available, the bills and answers have been indexed in the Public Record Office's printed *Lists and Indexes*, search through which might indicate whether our knowledge of Whetstone's life could be augmented from this source. I must reject the suggestion twice made that the R. B. who wrote verses commending *The English Myrror* (1586) was Richard Breton, elder brother of the poet Nicholas Breton. This Richard Breton is not recorded as having written anything whatever and he was moreover dead by 5 May, 1585, when Elizabeth Gascoigne's estate was administered by Catherine Wright wife of Richard Wright yeoman of Sutton Nr Astley Leics., formerly married to Richard Breton (see Grosart, *The Works of Nicholas Breton*). This is part of an attempt to strengthen the evidence for friendship between Nicholas Breton, George Gascoigne and Whetstone (though the latter's literary indebtedness to Gascoigne is denied). It is somewhat surprising to find in the pages devoted to the Remembrances of George Gascoigne and Nicholas Bacon references to Captain B. M. Ward's articles on Gascoigne whilst the later work of C. T. Prouty, whose study of Gascoigne came from the Columbia University last year, is ignored. Reference to this book would have saved Dr Izard from quoting B. M. Ward's unnecessary mystifications as to the place of Gascoigne's death. For the circumstances of Whetstone's own death at the hands of Captain

Edmund Udall whilst carrying out his duties as a commissary of musters Dr Izard is indebted to Professor Mark Eccles' letter to the *Times Literary Supplement* for 27 August 1931; but a much fuller account is given with the help of the abstracts in the *Calendar of State Papers Foreign*.

JEAN ROBERTSON

LONDON

The Tragical History of Christopher Marlowe. By JOHN BAKELESS. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Oxford University Press. 1942. Vol. I, xvi+375 pp. Vol. II, vi+432 pp. £2. 2s. 0d.

In 1937 Mr John Bakeless published, with William Morrow and Co. of New York as a one volume work, *Christopher Marlowe: the man in his time*. In 1938 this was re-issued in abbreviated form in England by Jonathan Cape, entitled *Christopher Marlowe*. It was reviewed in *The Times Literary Supplement* and elsewhere, and I gave a detailed notice of it in vol. XIX of *The Year's Work in English Studies*. The present two-volume publication is a considerably enlarged form of the earlier work, with illustrations, and with some new material acquired between 1937 and the end of 1940 when Mr Bakeless had to take up wartime duties. It is therefore singular that neither in his preface nor elsewhere, except for including their titles in his bibliography of more than one hundred pages, does he make any reference to the 1937-8 volumes or indicate the relation between them and this more imposing publication. Yet in essentials the earlier and the later publications have similar virtues and limitations.

Mr Bakeless has made his chief contribution to Marlovian research by tracing and making use of fresh biographical material from manuscript sources. Here he has had the advantage of grants from the Guggenheim Foundation and from the American Council of Learned Societies which have enabled him to make discoveries among British archives and put them on record. The valuable data that he collected concerning the dramatist's father from municipal documents in Canterbury, and relating to Christopher's Cambridge career from the Corpus Christi College Buttery Books were presented in the 1937 volume. To these are now added five further documents discovered in 1939-40 in the Canterbury Public Record Office by Mr Frank W. Tyler, formerly sub-librarian of the Cathedral library, who has put them at the service of Mr Bakeless. The most important of these is paradoxically the will of an otherwise unknown Canterbury woman Catherine Benchkyn made in the autumn of 1585. Four witnesses attested the will, 'Jhon marley, Thomas Arthur, Christopher Marley, John moore'. Here in company with the signatures of his father, a maternal relative and a brother-in-law is the only known specimen of the dramatist's handwriting. There can be no doubt about the identity of the witnesses (whose signatures are reproduced in facsimile) for another of Mr Tyler's discoveries is a deposition by John Marlowe on 5 October 1586 setting forth the circumstances in which he and Thomas Arthur and his son and son-in-law subscribed their names 'aboute a twelmonethes agon or moe'.

Mr Bakeless finds in this a confirmation of Marlowe's absence from Cambridge for two weeks, the sixth and seventh after Michaelmas, 1585, as disclosed by the Buttery Book. While this conclusion is to be accepted in the main, it should be pointed out that John Marlowe's memory seems to have been partly at fault for his deposition would place his son's visit not in November, but at the beginning of October or earlier. The salient fact however is that we now know for the first time that Christopher returned at least once from Cambridge to the family circle at Canterbury and was associated with them in a minor legal transaction. It is also of interest that, though in the Corpus Christi Books he appears as 'Marlin', he signs himself 'Marley'. This signature on the Benchkyn will and John Marley's deposition are to be welcomed as additions of first-rate significance to Marlovian biography.

Of the dramatist's London career Mr Bakeless gives in essentials the same account as in 1937, though with a good deal of elaboration and more detailed references to contemporary sources. But on the problem of who was responsible for his death at the hands of Friser, which he formerly left undetermined, he now shows himself inclined to follow Miss E. de Kalb and to hold that 'Marlowe possessed information dangerous to Lady Walsingham, and that her agent Friser was encouraged to silence him at any cost'. I had the opportunity of reading Miss de Kalb's MS. dissertation but remain unconvinced by her ingenious speculations.

In dealing with the plays Mr Bakeless is less concerned with their dramatic or literary merits than with their sources, stage-history and their influence. These are discussed with painstaking learning, but with an elaboration of detail that tends to become sometimes tedious, and with a somewhat paradoxical desire to go beyond the well-attested sources. Mr T. C. Izard has recently shown that Whetstone's *English Mirror* probably supplied Marlowe with most of his information about Tamburlaine, and though the dramatist was undoubtedly a wide reader, it is not necessary to suppose that he pursued the subject through a number of books on the Corpus Christi Library shelves. The episode of Edward II being shaved in captivity with ditch water is found in Stow's *Chronicle*. But because Parker's bequest of books to Corpus included a brief Latin extract from Thomas de la Moor's account of the King's death, Mr Bakeless thinks it 'not unreasonable to regard De la Moor as the source', though this extract does not contain the shaving incident. A more helpful reference, in respect of *The Massacre at Paris*, is to the pamphlet *Le Tocsain contre les Massacreurs*, where the account of the murder of Peter Ramus is closer than that of Jean de Serres to Marlowe's description.

Though his phraseology is varied Mr Bakeless is still as unduly depreciatory as in 1937 of all but Marlowe's acknowledged masterpieces. It is far too summary a judgement of *The Massacre* to set it down as 'one of Marlowe's failures'. And he says of *Dido* and the translations of Ovid and Lucan that they 'might just as well be lost like the [version of the *Helenae Raptus* of] Coluthus, for all the good they are likely to do Marlowe's reputation, either as poet or scholar'. In a similar spirit he speaks of 'the pointless imitation of Seneca in *Gorboduc*' and 'the refined inanities of Lyly' in his Court comedies.

It is not as a critic but as an archivist and compiler that Mr Bakeless has done special service to Marlovian scholarship. The extraordinarily detailed bibliography shows the far-reaching scope of his reading and research, and will be a mine of information to students of the dramatist's life and work. For this and for the new Canterbury documents he has laid them all under a debt to his prolonged labours.

F. S. BOAS

LONDON

William Shakspeare's Petty School. By T. W. BALDWIN. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. 1943. 240 pp. \$3.00.

This book, though it has appeared later, is in substance the prelude to the same author's *William Shakspeare's Small Latine and Lesse Greeke*. It helps understanding to think of it in three parts: a brief Introduction (Ch. I, Theory and Practice) illustrating by copious citation the background of ideas and concrete problems which had gathered round the first steps in Elizabethan education; then a series of chapters (II-VI) tracing and establishing the authoritative teaching tradition as embodied in petty school text-books in Shakespeare's boyhood and, lastly, the impress of this elementary schooling—the deep groove scored in the plastic mind—revealed by character, allusion and phrase in Shakespeare's plays.

The chapters in the second of these sections require pertinacity and close reading.

They are in large measure bibliographical, comparing and distinguishing the elements of the 'Absey-book' and Primer tradition and the relation of the latter to the *Book of Common Prayer*, the Psalter and differing forms and stages of the Catechism. It is a complicated story and it is necessary to hold the mind to the summaries and distinctions provided by the author so as not to be baffled by a sentence like: 'So the first section of the *Primer* is a conventional *ABC* but in English...and without the alphabet or *ABC* proper', and even more by this: 'As we have seen, its first part is an *ABC* and catechism, without either the *ABC* or the catechism' (pp. 45, 49).

The word 'Reformation' seems to me to need some care in interpretation in certain contexts. In the story as Professor Baldwin tells it continuity is at least as conspicuous as change; in fact the whole evolution from precedent to precedent is typically English—and 'Anglican'. There is still a tendency to diffuse a certain Erasmian, humanist glow over the whole field of Tudor education and Professor Baldwin is undoubtedly right to stress again and again the governing aim of securing religious uniformity and, consequently, the limited, non-humanist nature of the authorized petty school curriculum. This, indeed, was a thrifty sort of Tudor *Gleichschaltung* by means of a child's first reading-books. When, referring to the Henry VIII phase, Professor Baldwin says (p. 32) 'the emphasis here is on Reformation, not Renaissance', one sees, accordingly, what he means, but the antithesis seems to me dangerously neat, and I am not happy about the next sentence: 'The whole groundwork of the Reformation is laid in the Injunctions of Henry VIII in 1536 and 1538'. With the perspective of time we can discern reforming (in the sense of 'progressive', 'innovating') elements in royal or episcopal Injunctions and other documents from 1536 to 1545 (the formative period), but the relation of these to 'Reformation' (with capital R) is variable and would provide matter for subtle dispute, and so would their relation to wide secular pressures with a common bearing upon the vernacular.

Learning to read the Shakespearean vernacular is a full-time job and we are never likely to know the Elizabethan world well enough to trace all the footprints of experience and grooves of custom which are a part of the form and pressure of the time. When Professor Baldwin has concluded his strenuous preliminaries, he earns our gratitude by helping us to read Shakespeare more alertly, with a livelier awareness of what he and his contemporaries absorbed when they had crept unwillingly to school. It is interesting to see how the 'Chathechisme' had come to provide an almost instinctive response to the challenge or opportunity of a topic or a problem—'Good my mouse of virtue, answer me'. It is interesting, too, to speculate on Shakespeare's limitations in arithmetic. We could have done with more on this subject; the immense difference in mental apparatus between us and the Elizabethans in this respect is still not generally or not fully grasped. The meatiest chapter in this part of the book is, in my opinion, that on Holofernes—Shakespeare's Abecedarius or typical petty schoolmaster. Holofernes is put under the microscope once again and to good effect. He might have been the leanest and driest of pedantic jokes, but he has been sufficiently touched by a life-giving pen for most readers, I believe, to have a soft spot for him. He only goes dead and dull when identified with Florio, Mulcaster or some other, for Art is long, but it is the nature of men to die. Professor Baldwin will have no truck with such identifications and his researches provide him with one or two good strong nails to drive into their coffins. The petty school had to teach children to read English under Elizabethan conditions; hence its methods were brought by educationists into touch with the burning controversies about orthography and pronunciation. In this connexion Professor Baldwin falls foul of modern phonologists and phoneticians, and, I suspect, would like to drive a nail or two into their coffins. The crime of 'modern Germanic theory' is to waste time trying to square the 'phonetics' of Bullokar,

Hart and their crew with the ascertained stage of English phonological development in their day and to overlook the Latinizing tendency inevitable in such men—but is this so completely overlooked? In the last chapter Professor Baldwin puts in some hearty nail-driving practice on the thesis of Shakespeare's Catholicism.

The earlier chapters of this book will probably seem long-winded to most readers. One reason is that fullness of citation causes a hovering between the source-book and the history, but this, in view of the rarity of some of the material, is useful as well as generous. There is a precise objective—to establish beyond reasonable doubt the exact forms of the Absey-book and the Primer and Catechism as current and authorized in Shakespeare's boyhood and the real nature of the education (two R's chiefly—Reading and Religion) by which Shakespeare was himself moulded and by which he was linked to the majority of the literate in his audience. Points which his contemporaries would instantly take may very well be missed by us. It is the purpose of Professor Baldwin's last chapters to make sure that they are not.

The book is excellently printed and produced. Readers should not miss the facsimile extracts from an Absey-book which line the covers. They are not likely to miss the pleasing woodcut of a classroom of 1574—not unduly *gleichgeschaltet*; the dog, at any rate, preserves an independent purpose.

G. D. WILLCOCK

ENGLEFIELD GREEN

Religious Trends in English Poetry, Vol. II, 1740–1780. *Religious Sentimentalism in the Age of Johnson*. By HOXIE NEALE FAIRCHILD. New York: Columbia University Press; London: H. Milford. 1942. ix + 406 pp. 33s. 6d.

This second volume of Professor Fairchild's series on religious trends in English poetry inevitably provokes the comment, 'not much religion and very little poetry'. This, of course, is not the author's fault—he has done his best to find both, delving into dim corners, and charitably obviating the necessity for other scholars to follow in his exploring steps. But even he can find little to be thankful for in this forty years of wandering in the wilderness, and this in spite of the springing up of the Evangelical Movement in the midst of it.

Professor Fairchild's method is to examine the writings of one after another of the poets of the period, and by analysis and quotation to show their attitude to religion, classifying them, and giving enough general discussion to link up each group to its neighbours and to the common thought of the age. Generally speaking, the book traces the development of a tendency, foreshadowed already in the 1700–40 volume, towards various types of sentimentalism, with (again generally speaking) a gradually fading religious background—the religion becoming more and more obscured by a damp and woolly cloud of 'scenery, tears and universal benevolence', until it hardly survives except as a useful source of phrase and metaphor.

There are, it is true, exceptions. Both religion and poetry must be there when Christopher Smart stands in the centre of the volume, even though in the chapter entitled 'Four Christian Poets' the only companions to be found for him are Edward Young, John Byrom and William Cowper. Of the less well-known claimants of the period to our sympathy and admiration, it may be said that their interest tends to increase in proportion to their unlikeness to their contemporaries, as in the case of the Reverend William Thompson, with his definite Catholicism (at least in his earlier poems) and his leaning towards the Elizabethan spirit.

A large number of the writers dealt with are not only forgotten, but deserve to be; while the sentimental 'religion' of the majority makes one almost prefer the anti-religious outlook of the 'wits and scoffers', as Professor Fairchild labels them; one feels there was more hope for them.

No doubt the author has enjoyed his work, and while maintaining a scholarly and critical standard, he has succeeded in making a frivolous patchwork quilt out of many dull scraps of material. He succeeds also in reducing it to a comprehensible order and pattern, which deserves our gratitude. It is to be hoped that the next volume, on the romantic period, will not be long delayed.

The book is well produced and printed. One mis-spelling (*Southhampton*) presents itself in a footnote to p. 172.

MARY S. SERJEANTSON

FOWNHOPE, HEREFORDSHIRE

La Poésie et la Réalité aux Temps des Troubadours. By S. STRONSKI. (The Taylorian Lecture for 1943.) Oxford: Clarendon Press. 32 pp. 2s.

Professor Stronski, who was for some time Minister of Information to the Polish Government in this country, is well known to *provençalistes* for his excellent editions of Elias de Barjols and Folquet de Marseille, and for an indispensable volume, *La Légende amoureuse de Bertran de Born*. His lecture deals with the historical value of the 'lives' of the troubadours and of the details provided by the *razos* prefixed to certain of their poems. This question has been a subject of doubt and controversy for a long time, but the researches of M. Stronski have enabled him to enunciate a guiding principle which has been accepted by so eminent an authority as A. Jeanroy, who refers to M. Stronski as 'le savant dont les travaux ont le plus fait avancer la question' and summarizes the position as follows: 'les historiettes concernant la vie amoureuse des troubadours sont sorties de l'imagination des biographes, interprétant très librement les textes et rattachant à leurs héros des thèmes connus, pour des raisons qui souvent nous échappent; néanmoins, en ce qui concerne la patrie, la famille, la condition sociale de ceux-ci, ces chroniqueurs, si peu scrupuleux par ailleurs, ont essayé (et ils y ont souvent réussi) à se procurer des informations précises qu'il serait téméraire de rejeter sans examen' (*La Poésie Lyrique des Troubadours*, vol. I, p. 132). The further conclusion follows, that writers who are prepared to accept the *razos* as sources of authentic information upon social morality are liable to be led widely astray from the truth; it would be as reasonable to draw conclusions upon English morality from the number of detective novels published every year. Such is the position stated in this Taylorian lecture in vigorous and epigrammatic style fortified by examples drawn from the lecturer's researches.

H. J. CHAYTOR

CAMBRIDGE

A History of French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century, Part v. *Recapitulation 1610-1700*. By H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press; London: Oxford University Press. 1942. viii + 235 pp. 30s.

This is the ninth and last volume of Professor Lancaster's great history of seventeenth-century drama. As the title suggests, it gives a concise yet documented summary of the preceding volumes under such comprehensive headings as 'Background'; 'Actors and Theatres'; 'Literary Influences'; 'Dramatists' Conceptions of their Art'; 'Dramatists who began to write before Corneille'; 'Corneille'; 'Corneille's Contemporaries who began to write in 1630-48'; 'Thomas Corneille, Montauban, Quinault'; 'Women Dramatists'; 'Racine and other Authors of Tragedy, 1664-1700'; 'Molière'; 'Molière's Rivals'; 'Molière's Successors'. To the material contained in these chapters must be added the general conclusions that Professor Lancaster did not feel justified in drawing at an earlier stage. It is only natural that in dealing with such a wide and varied field there should be sections in which the treatment is happier than in others, and it may be said that in general

the author writes with more sympathy and penetration, even with more authority, about comic writers and comedy than about tragic writers and tragedy. The chapter on Molière and his comedy is a striking example of this. But everywhere Professor Lancaster's documentation and statistics are remarkably full and detailed.

Three very complete Indexes—a Subject Index from 'apples' and 'birth-control' to 'woman's rights' and 'worms', a Finding List of Plays and a General Index—form a useful, indeed an indispensable complement to a work which will long remain the supreme authority in its sphere. Professor Lancaster is heartily to be congratulated on having brought his survey to a successful conclusion in the face of many difficulties, both financial and those occasioned by the War, and his English readers will all be grateful for the cheery optimism of his Dedication 'To Victory'.

L. A. BISSON

OXFORD

Fifty Years of Molière Studies. A Bibliography, 1892–1941. By PAUL SAINTONGE and R. W. CHRIST. (*Johns Hopkins Studies*, extra vol. XIX.) Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press; London: Oxford University Press. 1942. 313 pp. 21s. 6d.

This handsome volume contains over three thousand entries and should prove a useful work of reference to both students and amateurs of its subject. The material is clearly arranged and easily referred to; printing errors are few; a careful reading has discovered no omissions and the inclusion of at least one work published in Germany since 1939. The arrangement and method seem to be impeccable, with one unfortunate exception: the exclusion of general histories of literature, in all of which of course Molière receives brief mention.

Nor does the work escape the fatal flaw of a bibliography unaccompanied by numerous annotations, which is the equation of the trivial and the important. The actual number of entries suggests constant and fruitful study of Molière in the last fifty years, until one reflects that a considerable proportion of these entries stand for quite ephemeral criticism or for investigation of minor points. Yet the book affords material for a conspectus of what has been done in our time to elucidate the greatest of French authors, and suggests a few important conclusions. The outstanding names would seem to fall into three rather loosely delimited periods. That before 1900 is dominated by Brunetière, Sarcey, Weiss, and (on the strength of a single contribution more influential perhaps than any here mentioned) Bergson. The generalizations and the solid penetration of these critics are still part of the stock-in-trade of both teacher and taught, but some of their assumptions were submitted to the detailed investigation of scholars in the first decade of this century, among whom the best known are perhaps Lanson, Rigal and Faguet. The method of these men has borne fruit in the work of Tilley and Michaut since 1920, who in turn have provided a basis on which new aesthetic appreciation could be attempted, and has been, by Arnavon and Vedel. Considering how many university students work on Molière, it is surprising that this aesthetic appreciation of his comedy is still at such a rudimentary stage. We are not yet agreed as to its laws and principles; such a masterpiece as *Tartuffe* is more often interpreted as satire than as comedy, nor is it clear in what sense Molière may be called a poet. The chief merit of this bibliography may be to show that the field of investigation is still immense.

W. G. MOORE

OXFORD

Baudelaire the Critic. By MARGARET GILMAN. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Oxford University Press. 1943. ix+264 pp. 20s.

Miss Gilman's book comes at a moment when interest in Baudelaire and his writings is probably more widespread than that in any other European poet. But his fame as a poet has been so great that it has tended to overshadow his reputation as a critic, yet his writings on aesthetics are amongst the most interesting of the nineteenth century. His taste and sense of values were very sure—surer than those of Sainte-Beuve, who was a psychologist rather than a critic—and he rarely made mistakes in those of his contemporaries whom he singled out for praise, often against the weight of adverse opinion of his age. He was able to perceive, beneath the trappings of passing fashion, the qualities which would endure and posterity has, in almost every case, ratified his judgments. Furthermore—what is more significant—we admire these artists and writers to-day for precisely the same qualities which Baudelaire thought worthy of commendation. He showed particular penetration in his criticism of Delacroix when that painter was receiving nothing but contempt and ridicule. He was the first in France to write appreciatively and intelligently of the music of Wagner at a time when his works were derided and his concerts a failure, when critics were complaining of the boredom of his compositions, calling them contemptuously 'du Weber travesti'. His study of Constantin Guys is the best piece of criticism on that interesting painter and it could serve, as well, as an introduction to the great French school of painting of the nineteenth century, the painters of modern life, Manet, Degas, Renoir and Toulouse-Lautrec, who came too late for Baudelaire to know them, although he had seen the importance of Manet's early work, the *Buveur d'Absinthe*, and encouraged him to continue in the vein best suited to his genius. On a smaller scale, Baudelaire's review of *Madame Bovary* is one of the most penetrating criticisms of that novel.

Baudelaire was, however, more than a mere reviewer of works of art and literature. He gave his life to the study of aesthetics, in an effort to discover a principle of beauty which would apply to all arts in common. His *Salon* of 1859—'An essay on Imagination with illustrations from the *Salon*' Miss Gilman aptly calls it—and the *Notes Nouvelles sur Poe* should rank higher than his penetrating study of the poetry of Leconte de Lisle which Miss Gilman claims to be 'one of the best in all his criticism' but which seems to me, in spite of its artistic discrimination and beauty of style, a literary review rather than a piece of aesthetic criticism.

The more deeply Baudelaire is studied the more difficult it becomes to separate the poet from the critic, since poetry and criticism are two facets of his artistic nature, two aspects of the same experience. He considered all artistic creation in the light of a spiritual activity, an attempt to make concrete a transcendental experience. One expression of this experience was the crystallization—unconscious almost—in the poem; the other—conscious—was a meditation on the nature of the experience and a discourse on the form in which it took shape. Art was the reflexion, the imperfect 'symbole' of eternal beauty and truth, and he held that it was impossible to imagine a great poet failing to become a critic. Otherwise he would remain an incomplete artist, a mere romantic poet inspired only by his instinct and his personal feelings. The poet is a translator of his experience into sounds, rhythms and images. The critic is also a translator—of another kind—a translator of his experience into meditation on its nature, into reflexion on its artistic crystallization and also into expression of his appreciation of the artistic creations of other artists. The critic must, however, go beyond this subjective 'translation', he must try to 'transformer sa volupté en connaissance' in order, by critical meditation, to reach a full understanding of art, beauty and even ultimate truth. That is the aim of Baudelaire's greatest critical works and an understanding of his aesthetic writings, an appreciation of the principles forming and underlying his judgments, lead to a fuller and deeper understanding of his

poetry. His criticism is the key to his poetry and his poetry is an extension and fulfilment of his aesthetic doctrine.

There have already appeared two important works dealing with the aesthetic aspect of Baudelaire's art, S. A. Rhodes, *The Cult of Beauty in Baudelaire* and André Ferran, *L'Esthétique de Baudelaire*. Miss Gilman's work is wider in its scope than that of Rhodes and it does not make the mistake which Ferran's encyclopaedic thesis made, of dividing the poet's criticism into various categories; the critic of art, of music and so forth. This leads to artificiality and, moreover, falsifies Baudelaire's fundamental conception of the unity of beauty, his theory that the various arts are only different translations of the same spiritual experience, different 'symboles' of the total aspect of beauty. He believed that the experience of beauty was similar for each artist—whatever his means of expression—and that each translated it into his own particular artistic idiom—poetry, painting or music. Then, since each art was only the 'symbole' of ideal beauty, it should matter little in which artistic language the vision was translated and it should be possible to glide imperceptibly from one art to the other. It ought to be possible to create a single magnificent art which would be a total expression of beauty, which should appeal, as he says, to all his senses 'fondus en un'.

Miss Gilman's book is particularly valuable in the following, step by step, chronologically, the development of Baudelaire's theory of art and beauty, showing the successive influences from which he gathered the raw material for his own conceptions. Delacroix wrote in his *Journal*, discussing the art of Raphael, 'Son originalité ne paraît jamais plus vive que dans les idées qu'il emprunte. Tout ce qu'il trouve il le relève et le fait vivre d'une vie nouvelle'. This paragraph comes to mind when one reads the criticism of Baudelaire, for his philosophy of art owes much to the theories of previous thinkers, but he took from each only what he could completely assimilate and made of it something wholly his own. Jacques Crépét writes with great insight, 'Baudelaire ne s'est jamais penché que sur son moi et sur ce qui lui ressemblait ou à quoi il voulait ressembler. C'est ce moi qu'il a cherché et chéri chez autrui. Il a passé sa vie à battre le rappel des atomes épars dans l'univers, qui lui semblaient propres à nourrir, fortifier et féconder sa personnalité'. Miss Gilman shows clearly how much he owed to previous thinkers such as Diderot, Stendhal, de Maistre and Poe, but she does not give sufficient importance to the contribution of the philosophy of Swedenborg which is the foundation of Baudelaire's main aesthetic theory of 'correspondances' and 'symboles'.

The chronological method which Miss Gilman adopts is fruitful for the formative period of Baudelaire's development but, when he reached the maturity of his talent, it could with advantage have been abandoned. After that, although he still read, still absorbed new ideas, these fit into an already existing pattern, without modifying it. His thought had attained its structural solidity and the additional material served to illustrate but brought no real alteration. It is true that she does not rigorously adhere to it at the end, but she continues to analyse each successive work, catalogue fashion, whereas it would have been more valuable to discuss, in the chapter entitled 'The Poet as Critic', the final result of the philosophy of art and to give the quintessence of it. The last chapter, with its summary of minor articles—many of them no more than transitory reviews—is an anti-climax and detracts from the impression of the book as a whole.

Miss Gilman's book is a scholarly study which shows a wide and varied knowledge of French literature and thought, and patient and thorough investigation of much material which throws new light on Baudelaire's mind. It should lead to a fuller and more intelligent study of the poet.

ENID STARKIE

Hispanic American Essays. Edited by A. CURTIS WILGUS. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press; London: H. Milford. 1942. viii + 391 pp. 30s.

This volume of essays commemorates the late Dr J. A. Robertson, best known, perhaps, to English readers as the editor of *The Hispanic American Historical Review* and of the recent 'Inter-American Historical Series'. Dr Robertson's own work lay chiefly in the field of Spanish colonial records, and his achievement in the bibliography, translation and indexing of material of this period is truly remarkable. It is natural therefore that this collection of essays, which is preceded by a biographical notice, should deal with Spanish-American history, although one would have welcomed too something on the Philippines, to the history and bibliography of which Dr Robertson made a monumental contribution. The book falls into two sections, one of which, containing eleven essays, deals with the colonial period, and the other—nine essays—with the period since independence. Professor Altamira publishes two short but interesting documents of the earliest period of colonial legislation, one of them another version of a document already accessible in print; it is a pity that the accompanying note in English is so vaguely worded and inconclusive. Mr F. B. Steck contributes an interesting account of the earliest Mexican literature. Other essays in this section touch on the commerce of colonial Argentina and on Venezuelan administration. A large portion of the book (three essays) deals with Florida, especially with the archives of that state. Two essays, one by Professor F. J. Rippey on *Justo Rufino Barrios*, and the other by Mr C. Lloyd Jones on *Indian Labour*, afford an insight into conditions in Guatemala, and this introduction to Central American affairs is complemented by an essay by Mr R. R. Hill on *American Marines in Nicaragua* which gives a frank but rather short account of the years from 1912 to 1925. As is bound to be the case in collections of this kind, the contributions vary in their appeal for any one reader, but this well-produced volume contains a great deal of miscellaneous information, and is carefully indexed.

E. SARMIENTO

SHEFFIELD

Essays on the Mediæval German Love Lyric. By M. F. RICHEY. With translations in English verse and a facsimile. *German Mediæval Texts*, Section B, vol. i. Oxford: Blackwell. 1943. 115 pp. 7s. 6d.

The fact that in the above volume Dr Margaret Richey tries to maintain a fine balance between scholarly argument and human insight gives the book an especial appeal. She is certainly right in stating that a poet's rhythm and melody represent more important criteria than logical consistency of syntax or thought, a point of view that was held by E. Sievers and became the keystone of his inspired learning. It is a scholarly method which, though founded on seasoned research, may in ambiguous cases (for instance that of authenticity) follow the promptings of sensibility and intuition.

Hence it is quite comprehensible that Dr Richey displays the most passionate tenacity in attacking the 'over-intellectual subtlety of approach' (p. 12) of certain scholars, singling out Carl von Kraus as the most eminent offender in this direction: 'Personally I feel sure that, in spite of the occasional naïveté despised by the modernist, the "first fine careless rapture" of the Romantics strikes nearer to the heart of the matter than scholastically trained logic' (p. 13). It is only to be regretted that Dr Richey has evidently not taken into account von Kraus's recent great work *Des Minnesangs Frühling. Untersuchungen* (Leipzig, 1939), in which he himself aims at combining intuition, common-sense and analytical studies. We only refer to the anonymous song 'Wære al diu werlt mîn' concerning which he comes to the conclusion 'Die Vermutung Lachmanns, wonach der Dichter Eleonore von

Poitou im Sinne gehabt habe, ist mir also noch immer am wahrscheinlichsten. Gegen sie spricht nichts, für sie manches' (p. 8); cf. also Dr Richey, p. 19.

The individual chapters betray that true integrity of scholarship which she originally developed under the guidance of the late Professor Robert Priebsch and now continues to pass on to a younger generation with such earnest zeal, and the words of her Preface include a heartfelt tribute to her former teacher: 'The chief debt goes back over many years to my earliest source of inspiration and knowledge, to the unpublished, unforgettably lucid and enthralling lectures of Professor R. Priebsch on the German *Minnesang*.' In the Introduction she draws a clear distinction between primitive and courtly *Minnesang*. The finest chapters are, we think, those on the passionate Heinrich von Morungen and the 'unrivalled' Walther and above all that amazingly powerful poet Wolfram von Eschenbach. Her peculiarly fine sensibility and understanding of the poet as a living personality find true expression in her study of Heinrich von Morungen, 'in whose fiery lyricism the courtly *Minnesang* attains its apex' (p. 39). The author is particularly convincing when her intuition is strengthened by lucid analyses of metrical problems and imagery (p. 45) and by comparative studies such as those on Reinmar (p. 43). In speaking of the latter poet she finds herself (perhaps all too unpromisingly) once more at odds with von Kraus.

Her chapter on Wolfram is a model of literary appreciation. We still feel, however (agreeing with Plenio) that in the case of 'Ez ist nu tac' (pp. 86 ff.) the lady's reply is not addressed to the watchman, who to our mind is not yet introduced. But Wolfram's lyric genius finds an unequalled interpreter and translator in Dr Richey. As a true proof of her scholarly attitude towards literature we should like to refer to the ungrudging praise which she has given, despite her passionate love of *Parzival*, to Wolfram's rival Gottfried von Strassburg (pp. 77-8).

For the rest, one might admit that though the term 'Manessischer Codex' (p. 10) is a misnomer, the name does not altogether lack foundation, for it was Manesse who gathered together at least the nucleus of the songs and illustrations, and the MS. appears to bear a close relation to the original collection.

With the exception of some misprints the book is delightfully produced, and students, scholars and the general reader alike will be grateful to Dr Richey for rendering this remarkable era of German literature so luminous.

AUGUST CLOSS

BRISTOL

Magic and Natural Science in German Baroque Literature; A study in the Prose Forms of the Later Seventeenth Century. By FREDERICK HERBERT WAGMAN. (*Columbia University Germanic Studies*, New Series, No. 13.) New York: Columbia University Press; London: H. Milford. 1942. 178 pp. 11s. 6d.

The study of the history of the natural sciences has been pursued with particular diligence and distinction in America, and it is against the background of the work of Lynn Thorndike and George Sarton that Dr Wagman's more modest contribution should be considered. His aim is to investigate the knowledge of natural science among the German intellectual laity in the second half of the seventeenth century, thus allowing time for the work of Galileo and Kepler to become known to the general public. He examines novels, polyhistoric and encyclopaedic works. As might be expected, his problem is to introduce some order into a mass of material in which no clear development can be discerned. He deals in the six chapters which form the main body of his work with what he has found to be the main categories. 'Miraculous Causation and Intervention' is the first, by which the author understands action by God or the Devil in 'producing something from nothing, taking out of existence that which already exists and miraculously although temporarily

interfering with all phenomena for his own purposes'. In this field he rightly observes that theology plays the part that is to-day taken by science. He then goes on to examine the persistence of belief in magical practices and supernatural elements, noting that it is often difficult to determine to what extent his authors actually believed in such things, but concluding that there could be no doubt of the general belief in some of them. Lohenstein indeed finds 'historical proof' of *Schutzgeister* (p. 35). It is remarkable that the relations of cases of witchcraft should be found to be almost invariably obtained at second-hand, in view of the many trials and condemnations of witches throughout Germany. Dr Wagman then discusses 'autonomous force in Nature' and draws a picture of an 'autonomous, self-containing nature, which God created and imbued with the necessary *Willensantrieb* before he retired from active participation in individual mundane phenomena' (p. 64). The next element to be investigated is the Pansophistic, where Dr Wagman makes a good case for 'retention of magical technique with the addition of a metaphysical interpretation of the process involved' (p. 69) and observes that it was only after the repudiation of Paracelsian chemistry that 'the concept of mechanical interaction of substances according to simply formulated, mathematical laws was possible' (p. 90). The 'search for rational causality', rendered possible also by the idea of an autonomous nature, involved a reaction against 'a view of nature which made necessary the explanation of numerous phenomena and natural processes in terms of the supernatural' (p. 92) and pointed forward to Leibniz and Wolf. It assisted also in the development of the urge to experiment in the field of nature, though it was in general only the rarer spirits who were thus affected, the laity remaining content with explanations of natural phenomena, however conflicting, based on reasoning from false and unverified premisses. 'Experiment' and 'experience' however, as Dr Wagman notes, did not mean for the seventeenth century what they do for us to-day: '*Untersuchung* signifies observation and speculation on the basis of the observation' (p. 128). 'In general', he says, 'the authors who enter this investigation seem to have been unfamiliar with the scientific achievements of the seventeenth century and with the new instruments which made so many of them possible' (p. 132).

This is restated in the 'Conclusion' and indeed emerges from every chapter. Dr Wagman is dealing with people who, for all their learning and formidable curiosity about *realia*, were members of the general public, whose information was not of the most recent and whose ideas were curiously muddled. Martha Ornstein in *The Rôle of Scientific Societies in the Seventeenth Century* has shown how narrow and weed-grown were the channels through which scientific information could reach the general public in Germany and clarify popular ideas even among the educated. Just how muddled such ideas were can be seen from the circumstance that Dr Wagman has been able to produce evidence for nearly all of the various gradations of thought on natural phenomena from the works of most of his authors—Eberhard Happel being particularly catholic. Though the author makes this point (on p. 91), it is not sufficiently brought out. An analysis of the views in one author (e.g. Happel, Lohenstein or Harsdörffer), or an investigation of the reactions of all the authors treated to any one group of phenomena would seem to be an essential complement to what has already been done. An example from English history is the admirable, though necessarily cursory, introductory chapter in Professor F. P. Wilson's *The Plague in Shakespeare's London*. For other reasons also one suspects that Dr Wagman, after analysing his material into categories conforming with those established by historians of natural science and bringing documentary evidence to support them, feels that his job is done. It is essential, when dealing with vulgarisers, to treat with some precision of what it is they vulgarise. He has an introductory chapter on 'The Heritage of Ideas' but this, though well enough, requires more support in each succeeding chapter. The whole of

scientific thinking in that period is dominated by the idea of God's work in nature, yet not a word is said on the theological background to scientific thought and investigation and not enough on the theological attitudes of the vulgarisers. This is a serious defect, which reduces the value of this informative and painstaking work.

In spite of these objections, the summary given above will have made it clear that Dr Wagman has produced an interesting and competent study. In order to obtain his material he has had to plough through the most voluminous and tedious authors. He has made their woolly and divergent views intelligible and related them to their background.

Besides the more solid merits of his book, there are two things which endear Dr Wagman to the reviewer. The first is the inclusion in the bibliography of a list of sources which he has found to be useless; the second is the footnote on p. 52: 'It is evident... that a good deal of hocuspocus goes on with respect to the use of "baroque".'

LEONARD FORSTER

CAMBRIDGE

Three Poets and Reality. By RUTH HOFRICHTER. New Haven: Yale University Press, for Vassar College; London: H. Milford. 1942. xiii+120 pp. 12s.

This study of Hans Carossa, Josef Weinheber and Albert Steffen, which comes to us from America, is of great topical interest, since the author sets out to analyse the attitude of three contemporary poets (a German, an Austrian and a Swiss) to the world of hatred and tyranny in which two of them are living as recognized and even honoured poets of the Reich, whilst the works of the third have escaped the German index, and justly so, since he has deliberately refrained from any comment whatsoever on contemporary happenings.

The results of this investigation are (in the circumstances naturally enough) rather meagre; and personally I regret the fact that Miss Hofrichter has concentrated her study almost entirely on this aspect—the weakest aspect—of the poets she has chosen in order to illuminate a dark and indeed insoluble problem. For who can tell what Carossa and Weinheber are really thinking now? Only someone with an almost superhuman power of sympathetic penetration, who could see beyond the resigned and gentle melancholy of Carossa, his partly ironical and partly tragic picture of the youth of Germany in *Geheimnisse des reifen Lebens* in 1936; or through Weinheber's fantastic lip service to current ideals in his Fichtean myth of language, in his glorification of the *Volk* above the individual, and in his almost obligatory cult of youth. Weinheber indeed has been rather carelessly dealt with in this study, since in *Späte Krone*, 1936, he clearly gave utterance to criticisms of his country and of his times, which do not bear out the assumption that 'in his seclusion he probably knows little of the more sinister elements in his immediate surroundings'.

SIEGFRIED-HAGEN

Held mit den blonden Haaren
und mit dem schweren Schwert:
Wir waren, ach, wir waren
deiner Tat nicht wert.

Mannhaft vor dem Feinde,
fallend, doch opfergross:
So nicht! Im Schoss der Freunde
fiel uns das schwarze Los.

Wir schlugen uns selbst zu Stücken,
Ehrgier, Wurmgift, Neid.
Gegen den Speer im Rücken
ist keiner gefeit.

Immer ersteht dem lichten
Siegfried ein Tronje im Nu.
Weh, wie wir uns vernichten
und das Reich dazu.

And these lines in *Dem Kommenden Menschen*:

Grässlicher 'Herr der Erde', wer bist du?
Seht, er redet von Gott und zertritt seinen Nächsten
wie er die Blume zertritt, und vermag nichts
gegen die eigne Erfindung, gegen
alle den Fluch des
Abfalls, der ihn berauscht und vernichtet.
Hilflos seine Vermessenheit, hilflos
seine Flucht vor dem Schrecken, schrecklich
aber sein letzter Ratschluss: Gewalt.

Miss Hofrichter ignores the first poem, and merely says of the second: 'The reference to a "terrible Lord of the Earth" may or may not apply to persons now living'; but the passionate protest against the powers that be in these lines written in 1936 are surely indicative of the attitude of the poet to 'reality'.

As for Steffen, a disciple and versifier of Rudolf Steiner, and the poet in whom the author shows most interest, he would appear to most of us on this side of the Atlantic to be too much divorced from 'reality' to carry any kind of conviction or hope for the future, despite his stereotyped esoteric recipes for cosmic reform.

If however the results of investigating the deeper thoughts of these poets about the dark world in which they are living to-day are largely negative, the general emotional attitude, 'the apprehension of a danger sweeping down on mankind like a dark current', comes out clearly in Miss Hofrichter's analysis of the tragic quiescence of Carossa, the nostalgia for annihilation evidenced by Weinheber, and by Steffen's Rilkean counsel of despair: a rebirth of the world in the spirit, since its physical life is doomed.

There is more in this study than I have been able to indicate in the space at my disposal. It is well worth reading, even if the light it sheds is rather dim and flickering. And I would like to close on the note struck by Carossa in what (oddly enough) appears to Miss Hofrichter as an 'enigmatic' and 'tantalizing' motto prefixed to his war-diary. I would like to close by these words of his, in the hope that he and all his like-minded fellow-countrymen in Germany will hear them: *Raube das Licht aus dem Rachen der Schlange.*

E. M. BUTLER

MANCHESTER

Das Oxford Book Deutscher Prosa von Luther bis Rilke. Edited by H. G. FIEDLER.

London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1943. iv + 684 pp. 10s.

Professor Fiedler's *Oxford Book of German Verse* has now acquired a companion volume, in every way as worthy and attractive. Ripe scholarship combines with genial humanity to produce this anthology, which presents all types of prose from Luther's Bible onwards, covering not only literature in the narrower sense but also philosophy, history, travel, autobiography, letters, folklore, etc. The arrangement is chronological, the text is where necessary modernized and supplied with short explanatory notes. Celebrated passages are there, of course, but the editor opens up many fascinating byways as well, and the reader's first feeling will be one of surprise as well as pleasure at the interesting range of authors represented, coupled with a desire to read them more extensively. Many selections hang together *motivesgeschichtlich*, e.g. those dealing with the *Sängerkrieg auf der Wartburg* and its repercussions in literature and music.

These pages teach us much, not only about the course of German literature but about the German mind, its hopes, fancies, retrospects, uncertainties, yearnings, introspections. As is bound to be, the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries provide the bulk of the material. Nothing could illustrate more clearly the rapid growth of German literature, combining the earnest directness of striving youth with the self-conscious vigour of a late arrival. We can observe the reforming movement of the eighteenth century, its philosophical background and aesthetic theory, the rise of the novel, the unfolding of patriotic feeling, the *Sehnsucht*, nature-cult and medievalism of Romanticism, and scholarship and realism; all are there, leading to the latest age. Professor Fiedler's intention is to give us not only specimens of good prose—and there are some grand jewels—but passages of historic and human appeal. He has chosen well and will give happiness and profit to all his readers.

A. GILLIES

HULL

Icelandic Poems and Stories: Translations from Modern Icelandic Literature. Edited by RICHARD BECK. Princeton: University Press, for the American Scandinavian Foundation. 1943. v+316 pp. 20s.

It is the aim of this volume, edited by a distinguished American Icelandic scholar, to give to the educated reading public unacquainted with Iceland, through the medium of the best available translations, some idea of the nature and variety of the literature of modern Iceland, from the revival in the early nineteenth century to the present day. In order that each item might be complete in itself, this admirable selection has been limited to short poems and stories, and these have been chosen so as to represent at once what is best and most characteristic of the remarkable development and present vitality of Icelandic literature, and its continued nourishment from the classical sagas and the Edda while assimilating much from modern Europe.

The volume will certainly achieve its purpose, and will also whet the appetite of the reader for more knowledge of Iceland: for both the poems and the stories here translated are in themselves of a high order. Naturally, the prose is more successfully rendered than the verse; and such a moving and provocative tale as Guðmundur Friðjónsson's *The Vanquished Heroine* retains much of its peculiar Icelandic quality in Mekkin Sveinsson Perkins's translation. Modern Icelandic poetry has retained and repatterned often the alliterative and complex metres of the Viking age, while assimilating—especially in lyric poems—much from the Romantic Movement: so that the translator is presented with special difficulties which can seldom be fully met. Even Matthías Jochumsson's most popular national hymn *O Guð vors lands*, though its metre is not difficult, loses a good deal of its dignity in Jacobina Johnson's rendering beginning *Our country's God! Our country's God!* On the other hand such a popular lyric poet as Davíð Stefánsson, who shows so many of what may be called 'common European' qualities, often goes well into English.

The translations are by various hands, all of them competent, but varying in literary sensitiveness. Occasional footnotes are added to explain Icelandic terms which are retained in the translations; but these are perhaps not frequent enough, and allusions to older Icelandic literature implied in the texts will sometimes be missed by the American or British reader unfamiliar with Iceland.

There is a too brief introduction, in which Professor Beck seeks to cover the whole subject in twelve pages, with the result that we are given little more than a catalogue of authors with descriptive notes. But the work of each individual author is prefaced by a usually illuminating page of comment, which often partly makes up for the sketchiness of the general introduction and contains valuable literary judgments. The practice of referring to Icelandic authors merely by their

patronymics, as if these were exactly surnames, is to be deplored; and such forms as *Stefánsson* and *Gunnarsson* will scarcely convey anything out of their context. Another concession to the 'general reader' which is of doubtful value—though familiar from use in nineteenth-century England—is the writing of the Icelandic *ð* as *d* throughout: for this must lead to frequent mispronunciation which could easily be avoided by using *ð* throughout and putting a brief explanatory note of the value of the symbol at the beginning.

The book is, as is usual with the American Scandinavian Foundation's publications, excellently produced, and misprints are rare. The publishers and the editor are to be congratulated on a most useful piece of work.

C. L. WRENN

LONDON

Everyday Hebrew. By CHAIM RABIN. London: J. M. Dent. 1943. 127 pp. 6s.

Modern Hebrew, as distinct from Yiddish, is something of an enigma and very much an important experiment in language resurrection. Hebrew ceased to function as a spoken language during the sixth or fifth century B.C., but was used for ritual purposes and as a religio-literary language down to present times. Zionism, however, courageously faced the problem of the application of the language to practical purposes, and now, we are told, it is the living tongue of more than half a million Jews in Palestine and among scattered Jewry. Dr Chaim Rabin has now made an important indication of the way that revival is proceeding. He devotes some 52 pages of his small book to a very condensed grammar and syntax of the modern language, followed by twenty-nine 'conversations' in Hebrew and English, in the style usually followed in a book of this kind.

A glossary would have been useful because thereby one could more easily assess the purity of modern Hebrew, and the extent to which modern words and terms are simply borrowed or transliterated. From a perusal of the 'conversations', however, we conclude that it is Biblical Hebrew which predominates, and that to a high degree. Compared with recent developments in literary and spoken Gaelic and Welsh, this conservatism is most remarkable, or, on the other hand, it may simply indicate an artificiality in the language to which it cannot cling for long. The analogy of other languages seems to call to Zionism to prepare for a time when the language will deteriorate by being really adapted to living needs and everyday customs. The first fifty years have laid a good foundation, but how long can the structure be kept true to its groundwork? It is for the Jew, especially the Zionist, to look to it.

There are a few points of criticism. The first sentence in the foreword, that 'Hebrew is the oldest of all living languages', is challengeable. The treatment of the grammar suffers considerably owing to condensation; this is especially true of the Dagesh in § 3. The pronominal suffixes in § 40 should have been given in Hebrew rather than in transcription. The transition in the exercises from pointed to unpointed Hebrew has been made too suddenly. Occasional misprints are present in the Hebrew text.

But the book is altogether interesting, to the Jews who will learn their native tongue, and to Jews and non-Jews alike who are interested either in Hebrew for itself or in the nature of this experiment in language resurrection.

B. J. ROBERTS

ABERYSTWYTH

SHORT NOTICES

In *Defoe's Sources for 'Robert Drury's Journal'* (Bloomington: Indiana University Publications, Humanities Series. 1943. 87 pp. 75 cents), Professor John Robert Moore offers a supplement to his *Defoe in the Pillory and Other Studies*, and one dealing with the two main problems of *Madagascar: or Robert Drury's Journal* (1729). It is certainly a work of fiction by Defoe, but as certainly a realistic account of the island; it is based largely on printed sources, but is coloured, and sometimes shaped, by detail which must have come to Defoe by oral transmission or from unpublished manuscript material. Briefly, Professor Moore's conclusions are that it is unlikely Defoe drew on Benbow's lost manuscript journal; that he used not only Robert Knox's *Ceylon* but also his conversation or autobiographical material; that he knew Everard's *Relation*; and was deeply read in contemporary and earlier geographical works, both obvious and recondite. Since at this time he was working on his *History of the Pirates* it is certain that much of his information must have come from the pirates themselves, the only white men at the beginning of the eighteenth century to know anything of Madagascar. The map that accompanied the first edition of the *Journal* retains much of its mystery: it was not made to illustrate the narrative, and several of its inconsistencies defy explanation. Finally, Professor Moore by a painstaking examination of the English-Malagasy vocabulary printed as an appendix to the *Journal* shows that here too there are odd inconsistencies with the narrative itself, and that many of the native words in the narrative must have come from another source. All the steps in Defoe's progress are not clear, and it is likely that some of them will remain forever shrouded (doubtless as their author would wish), but Professor Moore is to be thanked for giving us, with close argument, yet another example of the genius (it is not too strong a word) which made fact of fiction and fiction of fact.

GWYN JONES

ABERYSTWYTH

Mrs Lois Strong Gaudin's *Les Lettres Anglaises dans L'Encyclopédie* (New York: Columbia University. 1941. xvii + 257 pp. No price stated) examines in detail the numerous articles in the thirty-five volumes of the *Encyclopédie* which reveal impartially their redactors' knowledge and ignorance of English literature and philosophy. There are well-documented chapters on the different literary kinds, poetry, drama, the novel and the like, and a most interesting survey of English philosophy from Bacon to Berkeley, as the *encyclopédistes* understood it. That on these subjects the *Encyclopédie* was haphazard, ill-informed and ill-informing, has long been apparent to those who sample its pages, and now Mrs Gaudin's searching examination finally discredits it. In poetry Pope and Addison are the men, naturally enough, though judged by the space allowed him Thomson might well be reckoned the flower of human genius. In drama there is the expected praise and dispraise of Shakespeare's lightning-lit night, but here again Addison is leader. The extraordinary neglect of the novel, and especially of Richardson (Diderot's *Éloge* came in 1762), is but one instance of how the chief contributors worked in isolation from each other. There are omissions, contradictions, inaccuracies and absurdities a-plenty—so many indeed that, her work done, the author is driven to an exculpatory sentence: 'Ne méprisons pas trop le colossal effort des encyclopédistes: sans doute l'*Encyclopédie* n'est pas un chef-d'œuvre, elle demeure pourtant un monument.' But in this special connexion, one judges, not *aere perennius*. At the end of her useful study Mrs Gaudin supplies two elaborate lists, the first of contributors and

the articles in which they mention English writers, the second and more important, an alphabetical list of English writers and the articles in which reference is made to them.

GWYN JONES

ABERYSTWYTH

Mr Edmund Blunden's *Romantic Poetry and the Fine Arts* (Warton Lecture on English Poetry, British Academy, 1942. London: Humphrey Milford. 1942. 20 pp. 1s. 6d.) considers and discusses the 'community of mind' between the two in the first half of the nineteenth century, with particular attention to Keats, who 'worked and moulded the material of words in sympathy with the problem of other ways of expression', gems, painting, sculpture, architecture—'It might attract the proper man...to complete a critical biography of Keats from this point of view, with that of music and theatre'; to Shelley, whom Mr Blunden sees as influenced, so far as he was influenced by the fine arts, by the spirit of sculpture rather than of painting; to Byron, 'unconsciously a better artist when away from his antiquities'; to that highly typical figure Mrs Hemans; and so to 'the great originators Wordsworth and Coleridge.' The lecture is itself a succession of brilliant sketches for, it is impossible not to suspect, a larger work, which one hopes Mr Blunden has seriously in mind.

EDITH C. BATHO

LONDON

Mr George Harris Healey's edition of *Wordsworth's Pocket Notebook* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press; London: Oxford University Press. 1942. 6+106 pp. 9s. 6d.) must have been an amusing exercise for him in deciphering, detection and comment. The notebook, which now belongs to Mr Joseph P. Hall of Washington, D.C., is, as Mr Healey says, both personal and informative of Wordsworth's activities in London, Oxford and Cambridge in 1839 and 1840, with one possible but not certain extension to 1841. 'However we may attempt to classify the materials, Wordsworth himself has intermixed them guilelessly. On the same page with a reminder to buy some Gregory's Mixture and a pound of magnesia is an important version of part of *The Prelude*'—a version which bridges the gap, hitherto unexplained, between the E manuscript, Dora's fair copy, of VIII, 451-8 and the printed version of 1850, and suggests that there may be a different explanation from deliberate change by Carter or Christopher Wordsworth for other divergences between E and the 1850 edition. Mr Healey has printed the notebook page by page, with a brief introduction on its appearance and the two hands, Wordsworth's and another's, and—after the final, touching entry 'Call on Dentist'—a commentary, which gives the biographical background, information on persons and places mentioned, and textual notes on the fragments of poetry included. The result is a small but humane contribution to scholarship.

EDITH C. BATHO

LONDON

Mr Alec Macdonald's edition of Corneille's *Le Cid* (London: Blackie. 1943. 128 pp. 1s. 4d.) is a pleasant reclothing of a well-worn classic. The printing is good, the experiment of full stage directions may help younger students to grasp the dramatic action and the Editor's explanation of the Alexandrine will certainly help teachers. Mr Macdonald might have helped them even more if instead of his stereotyped introduction he had written a fresh presentation of the known facts about the play and of its dramatic merits. Corneille will not come into his own with English readers until they can seize the real point of his plays more or less as his contemporaries did. Why should we go on talking of the Unities as tiresome rules

which Corneille strove, and failed, to observe, when as a matter of fact, and especially in this play, he fulfilled their spirit almost to perfection in his magnificently successful concentration of Castro's rambling chronicle? It would be wise, surely, to explain how and why a tragi-comedy came to be regarded as the first classical tragedy, and this would lead naturally to emphasis on the dramatic energy which enlivens the whole play, on its constant and poetic references to youthful qualities such as vitality, exuberance, passion and pride, and on the remorseless way in which these qualities are set to operate in potentially tragic circumstances. Thus envisaged, the play is much more than a discussion of a moral problem and its author very far from being a lawyer before he is a dramatist. Situation, characters, style and rhythm fuse into a single aesthetic experience which fascinated the seventeenth century and when properly presented can draw applause from the twentieth.

W. G. MOORE

OXFORD

In *Marcel Proust, Reviews and Estimates in English* (Stanford: University Press; London: Oxford University Press. 1942. xviii+314 pp. 21s. 6d.) Mrs Gladys Dudley Lindner has cast her net wide and a little at random, for, in addition to English and American reviews, she has caught at least five French articles in translation. Her work serves a useful purpose because it covers the years 1922-1941, and thus enables the reader to trace the evolution, if any, of Proust criticism from the cult of the early days to the more dispassionate examination of recent years. It is unfortunate, however, that much of the Anglo-Saxon criticism of Proust is so second-rate; indeed many of the articles quoted by Mrs Lindner are pure journalism, testimonials, even 'puffs', of no permanent critical value, and few are of the texture and quality of those contained in the *Hommages*, published by the *N.R.F.* on his death. Nevertheless it is excellent that in these dark and difficult days the torch should be handed on at all and that it should be possible to publish so considerable a volume on the greatest author France has produced in the last forty years. For this alone the compiler deserves to be congratulated although one could wish that it had not been necessary to cut down some of the articles to a mere six-line paragraph.

L. A. BISSON

OXFORD

This now well-established series (Blackwell's German Texts) is extended by Mr Jethro Bithell's edition of a modern autobiography (Hans Carossa, *Eine Kindheit*. Oxford: Blackwell. 1942. lvii+156 pp. 6s.). The venture is fully justified, and the careful and stimulating work of the editor is bound to bring the author to the serious attention of wider circles. Linguistically, Mr Bithell has spared no pains to ease the reader's path. An excellent introduction discusses, with refreshing lightness of touch, the author's career, his style and technique, his teaching and the value of *Eine Kindheit* as compared with other German autobiographies. Mr Bithell's edition should remove much widespread uncertainty about Carossa, and will earn the gratitude of all students of German.

A. GILLIES

HULL

NEW PUBLICATIONS

July–September 1943

With the collaboration of PAMELA GRADON (English), R. J. McCLEAN
and C. BAIER (Scandinavian and German)

GENERAL

- BÜHLER, P., *Vom Werdegang des Dramas*. Basel, Geering. 1942. Swiss fr. 2.90.
FULLER, G. H., *Foreign Language—English Dictionaries. A Selected List* (Library of Congress, Division of Bibliography). U.S. Office of War Information.
Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies, ed. by R. Hunt and R. Klibansky, Vol. 1, No. 2. London, Warburg Institute. 18s. (21s. per volume.)
RUZIC, R. H., *The Aspects of the Verb in Serbo-Croatian*. Univ. of California Press. \$1.50.
SCHLAUCH, M., *The Gift of Tongues*. London, Allen and Unwin.
Slavic Studies, *Sixteen Essays in Honor of George Rapall Noyes*, ed. by A. Kaun and E. J. Simmons. Cornell and Oxford Univ. Presses, 18s. 6d.
WRIGHT, R., *Dictionnaire des Instruments de Musique*. London, Queensgate Press. 21s.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES

Italian.

- ERRANTE, G., *Sulla lirica romanza delle origine*. Chicago Univ. Press.
WHITFIELD, J. H., *Petrarch and the Renaissance*. Oxford, Blackwell. 12s. 6d.

French.

- CORNEILLE, P., *Le Cid*, ed. by A. MacDonald. London, Blackie. 1s. 4d.
HOCKING, G. D., *A Study of the 'Tragediae Sacrae' of Father Caussin, 1583–1651*. Johns Hopkins and Oxford Univ. Presses. \$1.25.
MAUPASSANT, G. DE, *Fifteen Tales*, ed. by F. C. Green. Cambridge Univ. Press. 5s.
PRÉVOST, L'ABBÉ, *Manon Lescaut*, ed. by M. E. I. Robertson. 2 vols. Oxford, Blackwell. 7s. 6d.
VOLTAIRE, *Lettres philosophiques*, ed. by F. A. Taylor. Oxford, Blackwell.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES

General (including Gothic).

- BENNETT, W. H., *The Gothic Skeireins*. (Diss. Pittsburgh.) 1942.
HAYES, J. C., *Laurence Sterne and Jean Paul; an abridgment of a dissertation*. New York, University Press, 1942. 75 cents.
MITCHELL, P. M., *Old Norse-Icelandic Literature in Germany, 1789–1849, with a critical bibliography*. (Diss. Illinois.) 1942.

Scandinavian.

(a) General (including linguistic).

- AHLBERG, M., *Presensparticipet i fornsvenskan*. (Diss.) Stockholm, 1942. Kr. 8.
CHRISTIANSEN, C. P. O., and H. KJÆR, *Grundtvig, Norden og Göteborg*. Copenhagen, Gad, 1942.
ELLIS, H., *The Road to Hel: A Study of the Conception of the Dead in Old Norse Literature*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1943. 12s. 6d.
HERMANNSSON, H., *Bibliographical Notes*. *Islandica*, vol. xxix. Cornell and Oxford Univ. Presses, 1943. 10s.

- MOELLER, E., *Poetic Style and Technique in the Heroic Lays of the Edda*. (Diss.) California, 1942.
- Place-names of Svalbard, The, Norges Svalbard- og Ishavsundersøkelser. Oslo, Dybwad, 1942. Kr. 56.
- ROSELL, E., *Prefixet o- i nordiska språk. En betydelsehistorisk studie. D. 1. Fornnordiska* (Uppsalas universitets årsskrift, 7.) Uppsala, Lundequistska bokh., 1942. Kr. 7.50.
- Scandinavian Studies, presented to George T. Flom by colleagues and friends. University of Illinois, 1942. \$2.50.
- SOMMERFELT, A., *The Written and Spoken Word in Norway*. Oxford University Press, 1942. 2s.

(b) *Danish*.

- BRIX, H., *Digterne og Fædrelandet*. Copenhagen, Gyldendal, 1942.
- HENRIQUES, A., *Modern dansk dramatik* (Verdandis småskrifter, 453). Stockholm, Bonnier, 1942. Kr. 1.50.

(c) *Norwegian*.

- BORGENSEN, M., *Nasjonalt gjennombrudd i norsk åndsliv. Tiden fra Petter Dass til Per Sivle*. Oslo, Stenersen, 1942. Kr. 13.50.
- HAFFNER, H. J., *Asbjørnsen og Moe's Norske folkeeventyr. En bibliografisk undersøkelse*. Oslo, Damm, 1942. Kr. 2.50.
- HANDAGARD, I., *Johan Herman Wessel som oversetter*. Oslo Damm, 1942. Kr. 2.
- INGEBRETSSEN, H. S., *En dikter og en herre. Vilhelm Krag's liv og diktning*. Oslo, Aschehoug, 1942. Kr. 11.76.
- JARL, J. C., *Mennesker og bøker. Artikler og essays om moderne norsk litteratur*. Oslo, Tanum, 1942. Kr. 7.84.
- THESEN, R., *Mennesker og makter. Olav Duuns diktning i vokster og fullending*. Oslo, Norli, 1942. Kr. 11.20.

(d) *Swedish*.

- AHLSTRÖM, G., *Den underbara resan. En bok om Selma Lagerlöfs Nils Holgersson*. Lund, Gleerup, 1942. Kr. 7.50.
- ENGDAHL, S., *Anders Österlings ungdomslyrik. En stilstudie*. (Skrifter utgivna av Samfundet för stilforskning, 10.) Stockholm, Geber, 1942. Kr. 3.
- FRIES, E., *Karlfeldt och fädernas tro*. Uppsala, Lindblad, 1942. Kr. 3.
- LAMM, M., *August Strindberg. D. 2. Efter omvändelsen*. Stockholm, Bonnier, 1942. Kr. 14.
- RODHE, E., *Geijer och samhället. En studie i svensk tradition*. Stockholm, Diakonistyr., 1942. Kr. 12.
- SYLVAN, N., *Svensk realistisk roman 1795-1830*. (Diss.) Stockholm, Seelig, 1942. Kr. 7.50.

English.(a) *General (including linguistic)*.

- DICKINS, B., *Yorkshire Hobs*. Reprinted from the Transactions of the Yorkshire Dialect Society. York, Waddington's, Mansfield Street.

(b) *Old and Middle English*.

- BOCCACCIO, G., *De Claris Mulieribus, Forty-Six Lives*, translated by H. Parker and ed. by H. C. Wright (E.E.T.S.). London, Oxford Univ. Press. 31s. 6d.
- BROWN, C. and R. H. ROBBINS, *The Index of Middle English Verse*. Printed for the Index Society. New York, Columbia Univ. Press. Subscription \$10.

(c) *Modern English*.

- AGATE, J., *Brief Chronicles. A survey of the Plays of Shakespeare and the Elizabethans in Actual Performance*. London, Cape. 12s. 6d.

- ✓BALDWIN, T. W., William Shakespeare's Petty School. Urbana, Univ. of Illinois Press. \$3.00.
- BATTISCOMBE, G., Charlotte Mary Yonge. London, Constable. 15s.
- EAGLE, R., 'Shakespeare'. New Views for Old. London, Rider. 10s. 6d.
- HAZEN, A. T., A Bibliography of the Strawberry Hill Press. With a Bibliography of the Detached Pieces by A. T. Hazen and J. P. Kirby. Yale and Oxford Univ. Presses. 66s. 6d.
- H., T., Oenone and Paris, ed. by J. Quincy Adams. Washington, D.C., Folger Shakespeare Library. \$2.50.
- KAYE-SMITH, S. and G. B. STERN, Talking on Jane Austen. London, Cassell. 12s. 6d.
- MARTIN, B., Modern American Drama and Stage. Pilot Press. 7s. 6d.
- Merry Devil of Edmonton, the, ed. by W. A. Abrams. Durham N.C., Duke Univ. Press. \$3.50.
- MEYER, G. W., Wordsworth's Formative Years. Michigan and Oxford Univ. Presses. \$3.50.
- OFFOR, R., A Collection of Books in the University Library, Leeds, printed before the 19th century, containing (a) Translations from English into French, (b) French Books on Great Britain. Part 6, 1687-1702. Leeds, Chorley and Pickersgill.
- PEARSON, H., Conan Doyle: His Life and Art. London, Methuen. 12s. 6d.
- PROCTOR, S. K., Thomas de Quincey's Theory of Literature. Michigan and Oxford Univ. Presses. \$3.50.
- RINGLER, W., Stephen Gosson, Princeton and Oxford Univ. Presses. 13s. 6d.
- SPENSER, E., The Minor Poems, Vol. 1, ed. by E. Greenlaw, C. G. Osgood, F. M. Padelford, R. Heffner. Johns Hopkins and Oxford Univ. Presses. 45s. 6d.
- ✓TILLYARD, E. M. W., The Elizabethan World Picture. London, Chatto and Windus. 6s.
- WHITE, W., John Donne since 1900. Bibliography of Periodical Articles. Boston, Mass., F. W. Faxon.
- ✓WILSON, J. D., The Fortunes of Falstaff. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 6s.

erman. (Date, unless otherwise stated, 1942.)

(a) General (including linguistic).

- STRACHEY, A., A New German-English Psycho-Analytical Vocabulary. London, Baillière, 1943. 10s. 6d.
- SVERDRUP, J., and I. DAL, Tysk syntaks i historisk fremstilling. Oslo, Gyldendal. Kr. 17.25.

(b) Old and Middle High German.

- BARTELMEZ, E. H., Williram's *Expositio in Cantica Canticorum*. (Diss. Yale.)
- LANGE, E. B., A Middle High German Benedictine Rule; MS. Wilhering, Austria, No. 14; published for the first time with philological introduction and notes. (Diss. Columbia.) Latrobe, Pa., Archabbey Press.
- RICHEY, MARGARET F., Essays on the Mediæval German Love Lyric. Oxford, Blackwell. 1943. (7s. 6d. paper.) 10s.
- TILLMAN, J. V., An Edition of *Hort von der Astronomy* from the Colmar MS. (CGM 4997), with an introduction on the history of the MHG *Wartburgkrieg*. Planographed. (Diss. Chicago.)

(c) Early New High German.

- CORNETTE, J. C., Jr., Proverbs and proverbial expressions in the German works of Martin Luther. (Diss. North Carolina.)
- FORSTER, HANS, Hans Rud. Rebmann und sein *Poetisch Gastmahl zweier Berge*. Ein Beitrag zur Kultur- u. Literaturgeschichte der deutschen Schweiz um die Wende des 16. Jahrhunderts. Frauenfeld, Huber. Swiss fr. 6.
- KOZUMPLIK, W. A., The phonology of Jacob Ayryer's language, based on his rhymes. Planographed. (Diss. Chicago.)

(d) *Modern German.*

- BAUMGARTNER, P., *Die Gestaltung des Seelischen in Zesens Romanen*. Frauenfeld, Huber. Swiss fr. 6.50.
- BINGER, N. H., *Verbal Irony in the Works of E. T. A. Hoffmann*. (Diss. Ohio.)
- BOENNIGER, H. R., *Gesellschaftsfeindliche Elemente im individualistischen deutschen Roman der Jahrhundertwende*. (Diss. Stanford.)
- BOYD, JAMES, *Goethe's Iphigenie auf Tauris. An Interpretation and Critical Analysis*. Oxford, Blackwell, 1943. 12s. 6d.
- CATTANI, J. M., *Studien zum Deutschen Tassobild des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts*. (Diss. Freiburg.) 1941.
- FIVIAN, E. A., *Georg Kaiser und seine Stellung im Expressionismus*. (Diss. Harvard.)
- GOETHE, J. W., *Die Leiden des Jungen Werthers*, ed. by E. L. Stahl. Oxford, Blackwell. 6s.
- GOETHE, J. W., *Urfaust and Faust, ein Fragment*, ed. by L. A. Willoughby. Oxford, Blackwell, 1943. 10s. 6d.
- HEUSSER, N., *Barock und Romantik. Versuch einer vergleichenden Darstellung*. Frauenfeld, Huber. Swiss fr. 6.50.
- HOFRICHTER, R. J., *Three Poets and Reality: Study of a German, an Austrian, and a Swiss Contemporary Lyricist*. Pub. for Vassar College, Yale and Oxford Univ. Presses, 1943. 12s.
- HULLIGER, E., *Studien zur Romantik in der Literatur der deutschen Schweiz*. (Diss. Bern.) 1941.
- JONSSON, R. E., *Clara Ratzka als Romanschriftstellerin (1872-1928)*. (Diss. New York.)
- KAUFMAN, F. W., *Schiller, Poet of Philosophical Idealism*. Oberlin, Ohio, Acad. Press. \$2.50.
- KOERBER, R. D., *The Authenticity of the Zeitbilder in Gutzkow's Ritter vom Geiste*. (Diss. Northwestern.)
- MOSELEY, M. S., *Words and Imagery in Binding's Poetry*. (Diss. Indiana.)
- OECHLER, W. F., *A Study of the Motivation in the Drama of Friedrich Hebbel*. (Diss. Harvard.)
- PLETSCHER, C., *Jeremias Gotthelfs Anne Bäbi Jowäger. Weltbild und Schöpfungsfertum*. Schaffhausen, Meili. 1941. Swiss fr. 3.50.
- REICHELT, H. W., *Studies in the Weltanschauung of Gottfried Keller*. (Diss. Illinois.)
- RESINKOW, S., *Das Gesellschaftsbild im Romanwerk Theodor Fontanes*. (Diss. Wisconsin.)
- RUNGE, E. A., *Primitivism and related ideas in Sturm und Drang literature*. (Diss. Johns Hopkins.)
- SCHOLZ, A., *Goethe's Gestalten*. (Diss. Yale.)
- SKIDMORE, W. E., *Eichendorff's Weltanschauung as revealed in his language*. (Diss. Illinois.)
- STEINER, O., *Das zeitgeschichtliche Element in den Faustgestaltungen der Stürmer und Dränger*. (Diss. New York.)
- TABAK, I., *Judaic lore in Heine*. (Diss. John Hopkins.)
- TERRY, A. E., *The literary significance of the Silesian elements in the works of Carl Hauptmann and Hermann Stehr*. (Diss. Stanford.)
- WOODBIDGE, M., *Key-words in the language of Agnes Miegel*. (Diss. Illinois.)
- WORMLEY, S. L., *Heine in England*. North Carolina and Oxford Univ. Presses, 1943. 18s.
- WRIGHT, J. D., *Hebbel's theory of tragic guilt and its application in Judith and Agnes Bernauer*. (Diss. Wisconsin.)
- ZIMMERMANN, W. S., *Christentum und Heidentum in Hebbels Leben und Werken*. (Diss. New York.)

MILTON AND LIBERTY

Much interesting work has been done of late¹ on the question of Milton's thought on religious and political matters, as it can be studied in *Paradise Lost* and the *De Doctrina*, which lay hidden so long and was ultimately the occasion of Macaulay's flamboyant essay in the *Edinburgh Review*. Such work has been greatly helped by the admirably complete edition of Milton's works, verse and prose, collected and uncollected, issued by the Columbia University Press, pleasant to use and easy to refer to. CE. or CM. xiv, 230 (= Columbia Edition or Columbia Milton, vol. xiv, p. 230) is sufficient for any reader with the edition at hand. To this should be added Professor William Haller's *Tracts on Liberty in the Puritan Revolution, 1638-1647*, 3 vols., by the same Press (1934), and the same writer's *The Rise of Puritanism* (1938). The other works concerned are to some extent interlinked. They are *A Study in Milton's Christian Doctrine*, by Arthur Sewell, Professor of English Literature at Auckland University, New Zealand (1939), *The Great Argument, A Study of Milton's De Doctrina as a Gloss upon Paradise Lost*, by Maurice Kelley, Princeton University Press (1941), and *Milton and the Puritan Dilemma, 1641-1660*, by Arthur Barker, Professor of English in Trinity College of the University of Toronto (1942). The last work was done under the influence of Professor A. S. P. Woodhouse, one of whose articles on the same subject, 'Puritanism and Liberty', reprinted from the *University of Toronto Quarterly* (1935), has reached me. Mr C. S. Lewis's *A Preface to Paradise Lost* is to some extent an offshoot from Sewell's work.

Two main questions are at issue, Milton's Arianism and his conception of civil and religious liberty. Was he, when he wrote the great poem, the Arian he so clearly describes himself in the *De Doctrina*? Was he in his defence of liberty, of which he boasted in the sonnet addressed to Cyriack Skinner on his blindness, in any way or measure a precursor of either the *Aufklärung* in religious thought or the political liberalism of the nineteenth century?

Mr Sewell's contention is that, when he composed the poem, Milton was still the Trinitarian he certainly had been in the earliest poems and tracts, though there are signs of a changing mind; that the *De Doctrina* as we have it represents a later development; and that later still his mind underwent a further change, so that he abandoned the work which he had thought of as his most precious gift to the world: 'quibus melius aut pretiosius nihil habeo'. The last position seems to me quite untenable, but of that later if space allows.

His contention that Milton was still a Trinitarian when at work on the poem starts from a careful examination of the MS. of the *De Doctrina*. The conclusion he comes to, if I follow him aright, is that the work underwent some three revisions, and that its final form as we have it was not reached until after 1660. The first part of the MS. as we have it was completely transcribed by Daniel Skinner, thus losing any evidence which it might have contained of changes in Milton's thought. But in the latter part, which is still in the handwriting of Milton's secretary Jeremie Picard (with corrections in several hands), there are so many alterations as to suggest that, if we had the first part in the same condition, we should find similar

¹ (a) *The Great Argument*, by Maurice Kelley. Princeton University Press. 1941. xiv + 269 pp. 33s. 6d. (b) *Milton and the Puritan Dilemma*,

1641-1660, by Arthur Barker. University of Toronto Press. 1942. xxiv + 440 pp. \$3.75.

corrections; and as Sewell discovers in the later part evidences still lingering of Milton's Trinitarianism we should find the same in the transcribed part. In the *Paradise Lost* Milton, he contends, speaks of the Son as coequal and coessential with the Father. Kelley's book is in the main a reply to Sewell's argument, a reply which Barker accepts:

The question of the period of Milton's life with which the *De Doctrina Christiana* (as it now stands) should be associated seems to me to have been settled by Kelley's recent volume (Barker, op. cit. p. 397).

I do not propose to discuss the argument in full detail, because I myself do not think that Milton's Arianism or semi-Arianism really affects the fundamental Christianity of his faith as reflected in the poem. But I must touch briefly on a few of these contentions.

To begin with, I would point out that there are certain cautions one must have in mind in deciding on the exact significance of some of the expressions which Milton uses. First, as early as 1641, in his tracts on prelacy, Milton resolved that the Scriptures and the Scriptures only were to be for him the final test of truth, a position from which he never departed except in so far as he also accepts the guidance of the Spirit:

Under the Gospel we possess, as it were, a twofold Scripture: one external, which is the written word, and the other internal, which is the Holy Spirit, written in the hearts of believers, according to the promise of God, and with the intent that it should by no means be neglected (*De Doctrina*, I, cap. xxx).

The written word, I say, of the New Testament, had been liable to frequent corruption, and in some instances has been corrupted through the number, and in some cases the bad faith of those through whom it has been handed down, the variety and discrepancy of the original manuscripts, and the additional diversity produced by subsequent transcripts and printed editions. But the Spirit which leads to truth cannot be corrupted, neither is it easy to deceive a man who is truly spiritual (*ibid.* p. 275).

Milton thought that the Old Testament text had been better preserved, not aware that all the extant Hebrew versions derive from one archetype, which is not accepted by scholars as free from error. Secondly, regarding the Scripture as the sole authority Milton in the poem uses the very words of Scripture without accepting the gloss which theologians have put upon it, or defining exactly the sense in which he is using it himself. He is writing a poem, not a thesis; that was to come later. The shining instance is the words: 'This day Have I begot' (*P.L.* v, 603). Whether Dr Saurat or I be right in the interpretation of these words it is certain that Milton has left them undefined. That he did not mean 'generated' seems to me clear from the words of Abdiel:

by whom
As by his word the mighty Father made
All things, even thee and all the spirits of Heav'n,

for Satan's claim to be self-begot is a lie and so acknowledged to be by Satan in the ninth book, if unwillingly:

Whether such virtue spent of old now fail'd
More angels to create, if they at least
Are his created.

Mr Barker has indeed pointed out that I was in error in speaking of 'the exaltation', for that was to follow the incarnation, crucifixion and resurrection, but admits that in order to get his story of the rebellion under weigh Milton has invented a previous exaltation of the Son over the Angels. Just so Vondel, to get his story of the re-

bellion started, invents a proclamation of God's intention that the Son shall take on himself human form and so exalt humanity above the angels. Again, if Milton writes:

in him all his father shone
Substantially express'd,

he is echoing Hebrews i. 3: 'Who being the effulgence of his glory and the very image of his substance.' Can one be sure that the writer of the epistle is using the word in the exact sense of later Scholastic philosophy? Moreover, as Barker points out, Milton in the *De Doctrina* distinguishes 'substance' and 'essence':

God imparted to the Son as much as he pleased of the divine nature, nay of the divine substance itself, care being taken not to confound the substance with the whole essence, which would imply, that the Father had given to the Son what he retained numerically the same himself; which would be a contradiction of terms instead of a mode of generation (CE. xrv, 193, 12-18).

Using thus the very words of Scripture Milton is able to tell his story without a challenge to the orthodox of his day. He is not a Lucretius intent on proclaiming a new and bold philosophy. That he was to do to a certain extent later. In like manner, and this is my third caution, I think (I will not dogmatize on the point) that in the tracts he accepts at times what is not precisely his own final opinion but is the prevalent view, if he thinks it makes no essential difference. Thus Mr Sewell makes much of the fact that in the late pamphlet, *A Treatise of Civil Power* (1659), Milton does not seem to have made up his mind that, as he was to declare in the *De Doctrina*, the whole Jewish Law is abolished for Christians (Barker, op. cit. p. 248; CE. vi, 40, 20-8). He is admitting that for many it is an open question. But he could hardly state his own opinion more clearly than he had done in the *Tetrachordon* as early as 1645:

For no other cause did Christ assure us that whatsoever things we bind, or slacken on earth, are so in heaven, but to signify that the Christian arbitrement of charity is supreme decider of all controversie, and supreme resolver of all Scripture... And this indeed was the reason why Apostolic tradition in the ancient Church was counted nigh equal to the writer's word, though it carried them at length awry for want of consideration that tradition was not left to be imposed as law but to be a pattern of that Christian prudence and liberty which holy men by right assum'd of old, which truth was so evident that it found entrance even into the Council of Trent when the point of tradition came to be discussed. And Marinaro, a learned Carmelite, for approaching too near the true cause that gave esteem to tradition, that is to say, the difference between the Old and the New Testament, the one punctually prescribing writt'n law, the other guiding by the inward spirit, was reprehended by Cardinal Pole as one that had spoken more worthy a German Colloquy than a general council. I... shall content me here to have shown briefly that the great and almost only commandment of the Gospel is to command nothing against the good of man, and much more no civil command against his civil good. If we understand not this, we are but crack'd cymbals, we do but tinkle, we know nothing, all the sweat of our toilsomeest obedience will but mock us. And what we suffer superstitiously returns no thanks (*Tetrachordon*, CE. iv, 135-7).

If Milton leaves this Christian attitude—which was that of Christ himself—ambiguous in the *Treatise of Civil Power in Ecclesiastical Causes* (1659), if he allows that it 'remains yet as undecided', it need be no more than an admission that his own opinion is not shared by all whom he is addressing. He had possibly learned something from the experience of the divorce tracts, which he wished he had composed in Latin. With these cautions suggested I do not propose to discuss the divergent views of Sewell and Kelley regarding single passages. Milton's final

creed was that of Wulfilas, the Moses of the Goths, and one need not, I suppose, accept the dogma of Tillemont that 'un seul homme entraîna dans l'enfer un nombre infini des Septentrionaux'. Milton's Arianism was just an aspect of his revolt against Scholastic philosophy, his resolve to abide by the Scripture:

As for the terms of trinity, triunity, coessentiality, tripersonality and the like they [Arians and Socinians] reject them as scholastic notions not to be found in Scripture, which by a general Protestant maxim is plain and perspicuous abundantly to explain its own meaning in the properest words belonging to so high a matter and so necessary to be known; a mystery indeed in their sophistic subtleties, but in Scripture a plain doctrine.

The *De Doctrina* abounds in such passionate outbursts. Milton's Arianism implied no depreciation of the Son in his theology. He is the Word by or through whom all things were made, by whose obedience and suffering man was restored to the knowledge of truth and freedom of will of which the Fall had bereft him.

Of much greater interest than this speculative point is the history as, in different ways, sketched by Haller, Barker and Sewell of Milton's thought regarding the questions on which so many in that 'period of storm and stress seldom equalled and probably never surpassed' were intent—political liberty and Christian liberty and their interrelation. It was strangely enough the question of divorce which set Milton's mind in motion while, owing to its more personal than general interest, it gave to his thought a slight declination, not unlike that given to the atoms in Lucretius's materialism, from which was to emerge, after contact with so many other minds, the whole world of his speculation finally given shape in *Paradise Lost* and the *De Doctrina*. To these the tract *Of True Religion, Heresy, Schism, Toleration, etc.* (1673) and the two last poems were a kind of epilogue composed when his hopes had been shattered by the Restoration, but began to re-quickened as Charles's Declaration of Indulgence made all Protestant hearts to tremble.

The study of Milton's development begins with Haller's *The Rise of Puritanism*, which covers the years 1570 to 1643. Barker follows with a study of the prose pamphlets from 1641 to 1660. Sewell has views very much his own on what I have called the epilogue. Haller's is to my mind the most interesting and valuable work, just because he is not so entirely concerned with the controversies, the desperate efforts to discover the *absolutely* right government, the *absolutely* right relation between state and church. His chief theme is the spirit of Puritanism, and the means by which the preachers diffused an ideal of true religion and the good life. It has often been pointed out that, though the Restoration did bring back the King and apparently the unabated authority of the Crown, it was not really so. The first great battle for constitutional liberty had been won, and was not to be thrown away. It was the same with the Puritan cause. Apparently the Church of England had returned with its authority unabated, and Dissenters were harried and persecuted. But it did not last. Toleration became the law, and when the next great religious movement began with Whitefield and the Wesleys, it was Evangelical in religious feeling and Puritan in morals. Nor were the Evangelicalism and Puritanism confined to the Methodists and other Nonconformists. The same spirit was active in the Church, and however much in time Catholic and Sacramental beliefs and feelings might grow, the mass of the English people were and, so far as they are religious at all, still are Evangelical in their religion and Puritan in their morals, theoretically if not always in practice. It is only in our own day that that temper has begun to dissolve, here and on the other side of the Atlantic, because of the advance of physical science, the critical disintegration of the accepted sources and history of Christianity,

and in addition, of late, the social disturbance which is the result of thirty years of war, open or disguised.

But to return to Milton. In the prelatical pamphlets Milton had taken the field in the cause of the Calvinism and Presbyterianism in which he had been brought up, the defence of the 'one right discipline' laid down so clearly in the Bible. Toleration was no aim of the reformers of the Church of England but the making of England into a Geneva, a Scotland, a New England—Presbyterian and totalitarian; and Milton is as sure as his tutor Young and the rest of them that 'Church government is set down in the Holy Scriptures, and that to say otherwise is untrue'. And then his hasty marriage and the question of divorce brought him face to face with a plain statement of Scripture forbidding divorce, a much plainer statement than any that could be cited to prove Presbyterianism of divine authority. It was a dilemma. Whereas hitherto nothing had seemed so plain as the word of Scripture, now it became necessary to show that 'there is scarce any one saying in the Gospel but must be read with limitations and distinctions to be rightly understood'; and therefore that the Scriptures require a 'skilled and laborious gatherer who must compare the words he finds with other precepts, with *the end of every ordinance*, and the general analogy of Evangelic doctrine'. I need not follow Milton through the angry controversy on divorce. If he could have secured a divorce on the ground of desertion there can be no doubt it would have been for the happiness of both parties, and there were as yet no children to consider, a consideration which is never included in any of Milton's arguments. But the crux for Milton was to get round the express words of Christ. The significant words in the above quotation are 'with the end of every ordinance'. It is the principle which Christ himself applied to the Law: 'The Sabbath was for man's sake.' But the only other Law which Christ thus frankly criticized was that of divorce, and so far from relaxing that, as he relaxed the law of the Sabbath, he apparently made it more binding. But for his own unfortunate error—the only error in the conduct of his life which Milton was ever to admit, and that is the kind of error, he tells us, to which the pious Christian is more readily exposed than the experienced man of the world—but for this, Milton would probably never have questioned the clear words of Christ. It is equally clear that if he had been a Catholic in a Catholic country, and a man of wealth and political importance, he would have got a decree of nullity as easily as many others. But now he must reason on the plain word of Scripture, and he has two main arguments. God could not through Moses have sanctioned what was sin. Therefore Christ is not rescinding the permission granted under the Law. He is speaking to the Jews of his day who have abused the permission. It was a hopeless impasse for one so determined to find in the Bible a complete theology and morality. But it launched Milton on a course which might have led him in the direction of such freer thinkers as Chillingworth and Hales, though ultimately it did not. For now, as Barker points out, the emphasis for Milton is 'not on reformation and divine prescript but on liberty and free reasoning' (Barker, *op. cit.* p. 75). Even the laws of God are not arbitrary. They have as their aim and justification the good of men. And Christ came to enlarge not to confine that liberty, to substitute for external negative laws the inward guidance and compulsion of virtue:

In every commonwealth when it decays corruption makes two main steps: first when men cease to do according to the inward and uncompelled actions of virtue, caring only to live by the outward constraint of law, and turn the simplicity of real good into the craft of seeming so by law (CE. iv, 75).

Every command given with a reason binds our obedience no otherwise than that reason holds (*Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*, CE. III, 45-7).

No ordinance human or from heaven can bind against the good of man; so that to keep them strictly against that end is all one to break them. Men of most renowned virtue have sometimes by transgressing most truly kept the law; and wisest magistrates have permitted and dispensed it, whilst they look not peevishly at the letter but with a greater spirit at the good of mankind, if always not written in the characters of law yet engraven in the heart of men by a divine impression (*Tetrachordon*, CE. IV, 137).

The position that the individual might claim that his marriage should be dissolved if the marriage did not fulfil the end for which marriage was created was just that on which many, including such opponents to Milton's first divorce pamphlet as Herbert Palmer (Barker, op. cit. p. 108), had defended taking up arms against the King. How much Milton's political pamphlets were inspired by the action of the Presbyterians in condemning his plea for divorce is clear from the opening words of the *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* (1649):

If men within themselves would be governed by reason, and not generally give up their understanding to a double tyranny, of custom from without, and blind affections within; they would discern better what it is to favour and uphold the tyrant of a nation. But *being slaves within doors* no wonder that they strive so much to have the public state conformably governed to the inward vicious rule by which they govern themselves. For indeed none can love freedom heartily but good men; the rest love not freedom but licence which never hath more scope or more indulgence than under tyrants.

So almost naively does Milton rationalize his prejudices. There had been nothing of all this in the anti-episcopal pamphlets. There the appeal had been to 'divine prescription'. In the divorce pamphlets, as Barker indicates (p. 111): 'The basic principle of divine prescription is replaced by the basic principle of human good, temporal as well as spiritual.' Churchouted by the Prelates, a 'lesion on his pride which he never forgave' (Haller, op. cit. p. 295), he consigned them to a terrible fate in the next world, and is passionate in his defence of the 'one true discipline'. Now, churchouted by the Presbyterians, he deals with them almost equally savagely, and turns to Cromwell and the army. But Cromwell will fail him too in the end and his rule be described as 'a short but scandalous night of usurpation'. It was the late Professor Raleigh, I think, who maintained that Milton's experience in the field of politics and administration (so far as he did take a part in the actual administration of things, he was at least the champion of the government) was a benefit to his poetry. Perhaps, seeing the kind of man he was. But one might argue that if he could, like Virgil, have sat a little apart, viewed the scene with a more philosophical, a more sympathetic, more understanding eye, he might not have left us as great a poem as *Paradise Lost* but perhaps more poems like the *Nativity Ode* and *Comus*. But such conjectures are idle.

Milton's justification of divorce when the end for which marriage was instituted is not fulfilled is on a par with his justification of the execution of Charles as a Tyrant:

He who marries intends as little to conspire his own ruin as he that swears allegiance; and as a whole people is in proportion to an ill government, so is one man to an ill marriage. If they, against any authority, covenant, or statute, may by the sovereign edict of charity save not only their lives but honest liberties from unworthy bondage, so well may he against any private covenant, which he never entered to his mischief, redeem himself from unsupportable disturbances to honest peace and just contentment (*Doctrine of Divorce*, CE. III, 374).

The justification of the execution of Charles is the good of the people. So, appealing to reason as a judge of the end and intention of any law or covenant, even a divine law or what claims to be so from its place in the Bible, Milton had begun to move

on a line that might have made him, what he has been claimed to be, a precursor of later liberalism in thought and politics. But this was not to be, and that for two main reasons, if I follow Mr Barker aright, and my own reading of Milton. I cannot discuss his linking of Milton's thought with that of many of the thinkers of the day. The one reason was that he remained the orthodox Christian he believed himself to be to the end despite some divergence on a few purely speculative points on which he appealed to the Bible for his own conclusion. The other was his increasing distrust of the wisdom and rightly ordered will of the majority of mankind. The chief question which exercised his mind after the divorce and the regicide controversies was the right relation of church and state. We cannot understand the mind of those years if we think in terms of the generally accepted view of to-day, here and even more so in America, namely that of a secular state in which all varieties of religious belief and practice that do not lead to social disorder are tolerated. That was only to emerge after a long time from the conflict of diverging views. The aim of prelates like Laud and Presbyterians like Baxter was that the state was to be religious and Christian, the Church exercising authority in all moral questions, the Church 'the divinely inspired organ of spiritual life in human society' (Haller, *op. cit.* p. 11). It was of course the same in Catholic countries. Baxter's complaint was not of the tyranny of Laud so much as of the fact that the discipline of the minister in each parish was kept in check. In presbyterian Scotland and New England that was established for so long as human nature could endure it. It was the duty of the 'ranselmen' in a Scottish town to see that no one sat at home from the kirk on the Sabbath. In Connecticut a man was fined for not attending meeting, and set in the stocks for kissing his wife on the Sabbath. From the first, even in his presbyterian days, Milton was against any pains and penalties beyond those that were purely spiritual—instruction, admonition, reproof and finally excommunication, the door kept open for repentance. It was in his breach with the Presbyterians and their endeavour in the Westminster Assembly to establish a presbyterian kirk with all the authority of its predecessor that he became a champion of the complete separation of state and church but with no toleration for prelacy, papacy or atheism. The thoroughgoing representative of toleration was Roger Williams of Rhode Island, the author of *The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution* (1644), which, with Milton on divorce, seemed to many the extreme examples of the evils of a free press. Williams went the whole length. He 'argued, not that the magistrate ought to exercise forbearance or tolerate differences of opinion, but that he is bound to allow complete freedom in religion. He must defend the civil rights, not merely of varieties of true Christians, but of "Jews, Turks, antichristians, pagans", even of papists, "upon good assurance given of civil obedience to the civil state". Such rights include freedom in religious association and the expression of religious opinions' (Barker, *op. cit.* p. 92). Milton no more than most of the other Puritan controversialists could accept such a solution of what Barker calls the Puritan dilemma, namely how to combine political liberty with the preservation of true religion. Both in the *Treatise of Civil Power in Ecclesiastical Cases* (1659) and in his widest extension of toleration, *Of True Religion, Heresy, Schism, Toleration and what best means may be used against the Growth of Popery* (1673), in which for the first time the now re-established Church of England is included, the basis of toleration for Milton is the acceptance of Scripture as the only ground of truth in religion:

True religion is the true worship and service of God, learnt and believed from the word of God only. No man or angel can know how God would be worshipped and

served unless God reveal it; he hath revealed and taught it us in the Holy Scripture by inspired ministers, and in the Gospel by his own Son and his apostles, with strictest command to reject all other traditions or additions whatever.... Heresy therefore is a religion taken up and believed from the traditions of men, and additions to the word of God. Whence also it follows that of all known sects or pretended religions at this day in Christendom popery is the only or the greatest heresy: and he who is so forward to brand all others for heretics, the obstinate papist, the only heretic.

To all others, including Anabaptists, Arians, Arminians, and Socinians, he will extend toleration, 'at least then let them have leave to write in Latin'. The Church of England comes in, I suppose, under the head of Arminians, and also when he writes:

The papal antichristian church permits not her laity to read the Bible in their own tongue: *our Church* on the contrary hath proposed it to all men, and to this end translated it into English with profitable notes on what is met with obscure though what is most necessary to be known be still plainest.

Thus on religious grounds Milton will not go so far as Williams. As Barker says:

The purpose of the revolution was not for him primarily political; it was to destroy Antichrist.... So far as he followed the Levellers and Williams in translating Christian into natural privileges, Milton was radical; so far as he refused to accept the segregation of the spiritual and the natural he was restrictive.... As the revolution progressed, Milton's confidence diminished; but if he lost his faith in the English people and his sense of the imminence of Christ's coming, the idea of the Kingdom remained fixed in his mind (Barker, *op. cit.* pp. 188, 191, 195).

The last of these quotations touches the other source of Milton's reaction against what may be called liberalism. He had hoped for a Christian kingdom in which not only true religion would be preserved with toleration for all varieties of Protestant thought and faith, but also bringing with it many political or social reforms. As I have pointed out elsewhere, Milton in the *Defensio Secunda* approves apparently the dissolution of the Barebones Parliament and yet is in sympathy with many of their aims. If he pins his faith on Cromwell: 'you alone remain', it is in the hope that Cromwell will carry out his programme: the abolition of tithes and the abrogation of many laws. As Cromwell failed him, and it became ever more clear that the majority of the English people did *not* share his approval of the execution of the king, his contempt of the majority became ever stronger:

Who denies that there may be times in which the vicious may constitute the majority of the citizens, who would rather follow Catiline or Antony than the more virtuous part of the Senate? But are not good citizens on this account to oppose the bad with vigour and decision? Ought they not to be less deterred by the smallness of their numbers than they are animated by the goodness of their cause?

(*Defensio Secunda*, CE. VIII, 176).

Milton found the solution of the problem of liberty in the Christian doctrine of the Fall, which for him, as for Johnson, as for Newman, as for the late Lord Salisbury, as for the Christian revival of to-day, was the solution of the insoluble problem of evil. See Mr C. S. Lewis on the problem of pain. But he drew from that doctrine more than, I suppose, most Christians would do to-day. True liberty is Christian liberty, and that not only for the individual but for the state. Only the regenerate have recovered right reason and freedom of will, both of which were lost by the Fall of Adam. And for that reason they alone must rule. For Milton the final form of political liberty is Christian Liberty, the rule of the saints.

True freedom in religion was the chief end to be achieved by Milton's commonwealth. This end, and the civil good of men, could only be attained in a state governed in

accordance with the law which is the natural counterpart of the law revealed by the Spirit and Scripture. Such a government was to be established, not by making the depraved will of the people the sovereign authority as in Harrington's system, but through an aristocracy composed of those having the law restored in their hearts and able truly to claim the privileges of Christian liberty. Though it could not be established in its perfection until Christ's second coming, a Christian commonwealth must be progressively modelled on the pattern of His kingdom. The good must therefore assert their legitimate freedom as men and Christians, and impose on the evil the external forms which accord with true natural freedom, though the evil are incapable of exercising it and would prefer slavery under superstition and corrupt will.

So Mr Barker sums up (op. cit. p. 303). So, allowing for differences as to what constitutes true religion and what heresy, Milton comes to the same conclusion as Plato in *The Laws*, the Inquisition in Spain, the Emperor in Bohemia, Louis XIV in expelling the Huguenots. So extremes meet. It was *not* to be the English solution. As Haller says, the ultimate outcome of the Elizabethan church policy and all that followed it was to mean

that the common bond of her people would in future be not their religion but their nationality, and that the religious loyalties of the English of the ensuing age would express not their unity as Christians but their division upon various lines as Englishmen. In the long run it meant that the swarming English of the ensuing age, as they became divided even in nationality and blood, would retain only the community of language, literature and custom (Haller, op. cit. p. 7).

It is not surprising that to Professor Whitehead Milton's championship of liberty was of a kind to be prejudicial to liberty. Milton was convinced of his own regeneration and wisdom, and so could be certain that his condemnation of Bishops, defence of regicide, support now of Parliament now of Cromwell, were all justifiable, and that the desire of the English to escape from the arbitrary rule of saints and major-generals was a proof of their hopeless degeneracy, their total unfitness for self-government; and Carlyle was of the same opinion.

Of Milton's final mood of mind as expressed in the two poems which followed *Paradise Lost* Mr Sewell, who disparages the *De Doctrina* as a source for a final appreciation of Milton's mind, and Mr Barker, who accepts Kelley's view that the *De Doctrina* and the poem stand to one another as a systematic, scientific statement of the theology to an imaginative poem cast in a mould derived from the epic tradition of Virgil, are more or less at one. His hopes for a state ruled by the saints, the regenerate, and thus enjoying true Christian liberty, being dispelled, Milton sought refuge in the inner life, the peace that comes from perfect obedience: 'A Paradise within thee happier far.' So Mr Barker. Mr Sewell goes farther in suggesting Milton's disparagement of his own work:

On the later poems, as well as the *Of True Religion*, I base my view that *De Doctrina* is not an adequate statement of Milton's religious beliefs. *Paradise Regained* is simpler in statement and more direct than *Paradise Lost*; speculation is more diffident, as though it had given way to limited assurance. In *Samson Agonistes* Milton's spirit is aware of its own troubles, and he makes his peace, as it were, with both God... and with himself by a self-surrender, self-acceptance which argues rest after much perplexity. In both poems he returns to Scripture; we have the feeling that after all the mind as well as the will has learned a lesson of obedience.

A return to Scripture is a strange statement to make about one who has so continuously, massively, and at times angrily made Scripture the basis of all the theology in the *De Doctrina*. There is to my mind little evidence of any radical change of thought in the last poems if there is a change of mood; and the old fires are rather hidden than extinct. The mutual toleration of Protestants who base

their beliefs on Scripture which includes now 'The Church of England' is in the tract *Of True Religion etc.* (1673) a call for common action against the old enemy, evoked by the Declaration of Indulgence issued by Charles, whose statements and promises were just as true and trustworthy as those of Adolf Hitler. It was Milton's contribution to the rising tide that was some five years later to throw up Titus Oates. *Paradise Regained* is the expression of Milton's feelings in their lowest mood of despondence. It is a noble poem. In Christ, 'this perfect man whom I have call'd my son', are embodied the finest qualities of the Puritan ideal—disregard of wealth and glory, submission to the will of God and God only. But he shares Milton's bottomless contempt for humanity:

And what the people but a herd confus'd,
A miscellaneous rabble, who extol
Things vulgar, and well weigh'd scarce worth the praise?
They praise and they admire they know not what;

The intelligent among them and the wise
Are few—

doubtless true, but a fact fit to evoke pity as well as contempt: 'And Jesus when he came out saw much people, and was moved with compassion towards them, because they were as sheep not having a shepherd.' In *Samson Agonistes* Milton's mood of despondency is beginning to pass. He had begun his career as a controversialist with the Calvinist belief in the will of God as written in the plain text of Scripture and not by us to be disputed. In the divorce pamphlets he had somewhat modified his view: 'There is scarce any one saying in the Gospel but must be read with limitations and distinctions.' We have the right to study and find out 'the end of every ordinance'. 'No ordinance human or from heaven can bind against the good of man.' Now he swings back to the Calvinist, the Lutheran conception of God as 'that being for whose will no cause or reason is to be assigned as a rule or standard by which it acts, but it is itself the rule of all things,...' (*De Servo Arbitrio*). To seek to understand the working of God in history, to say, as Milton had said, that 'No ordinance human or from heaven can bind against the good of man' is:

As if they would confine the interminable,
And tie him by his own prescript,
Who made our Laws to bind us, not himself,
And hath full right to exempt
Whomso it pleases him by choice
From national obstriction, without taint
Of sin or legal debt;
For with his own laws he can best dispense.

But God will avenge himself upon his enemies, Samson's enemies and, he is beginning to hope, Milton's. He has not forgotten his old enemies, Lords and Priests:

Lords are lordliest in their wine;
And the well-feasted priest then soonest fir'd
With zeal, if aught Religion seem concern'd:
No less the people on their holy-days
Impetuous, insolent, unquenchable.

Revenge is the dominant note of Milton's last poem:

Samson hath quit himself
Like Samson, and heroically hath finished
A life heroic on his enemies
Fully reveng'd, hath left them years of mourning.

One Christian virtue Milton never learned, humility. Through one experience of the Evangelical Christian, whether Puritan in the seventeenth century or Wesleyan in the eighteenth, Milton never passed:

He thought of divine inspiration in terms of heavenly light; but he never had the profoundly-moving religious experience, the sense of mystical rebirth and miraculous enlightenment, at once supernatural in its origins and enrapturing in its effects, which provided the Puritan extremists with their energetic and fiery zeal....The typical experience of the Bedford tinker was not for him. He never in any sense regarded himself as the 'chief of sinners'....He was never the helpless and passive recipient of divine assistance; such support came to him from the studious summoning up of 'all his reason and deliberation' (Barker, *op. cit.* cap. vi, p. 81).

But did not his reason too often rationalize the voice of his temperament? We are told just now very emphatically and doubtless justly that to see in our fellow-men the children of God is the best security of our doing our duty to them, that Christianity is or ought to be the transcendent sanction of Humanism. The converse is true. If we come to regard our fellow-men with abhorrence qualified by contempt, as in Milton's last work, or by pity, as Carlyle confessed to Espinasse, our idea of God will suffer. The God of *Paradise Lost* is as arbitrary in his dealings with angels and men as Milton in his relations with his wife and his daughters.

It has been the plan of Divine Providence to ground what is good and true in religion and morals on the basis of our good natural feelings. What we are towards our earthly friends in the instincts and wishes of our infancy, such we are to become at length towards God and man in the extended field of our duties as accountable beings. To honour our parents is the first step towards honouring God; to love our brethren according to the flesh, the first step to considering all men our brethren....And we know from the highest of all authority that one can only learn to love God whom one has not seen by loving our brethren whom we do see (Newman).

To begin with Milton had thought of his fellow-men as highly as of himself. It was revolutionary politics which to a great extent warped and hardened his sympathies.

H. J. C. GRIERSON

EDINBURGH

THE USE MADE OF OWEN FELLTHAM'S 'RESOLVES': A STUDY IN PLAGIARISM

There is no evidence to show that the publication of Owen Felltham's *Resolves Divine, Morall, Politicall* in 1623¹ caused any stir in the literary world; but their reception must have been sufficiently warm to warrant the publication of *Resolves A Duple Century one new an other of a second Edition* in 1628. The demand for this volume necessitated further editions in 1629, 1631, 1634, 1636 and 1647. As will be seen, these quarto editions of the *Resolves* were well known and well used by many writers. They were followed by four folio editions (containing many additions and alterations made by Felltham before his death²) in 1661, 1670, 1677 and 1696; and by a final edition of Felltham's works in 1709.

Actual references to Felltham's writings during the seventeenth century are remarkably few. Thomas Randolph wrote an unsolicited poem in appreciation of the literary and moral qualities of the *Resolves*, and this is the only public eulogy that Felltham seems to have received in his lifetime. The *Resolves* are quoted four times in the expanded version of David Tuvill's *Vade Mecum* (1629). Many others signified their approval and admiration by tacitly borrowing phrases from the *Resolves* for insertion in their own works. Plagiarism in the seventeenth century was not the literary offence that it has since become: but even so, it is hard to believe that the use made of the *Resolves* by the Earl of Manchester and Richard Younger should have been countenanced. Perhaps the depredations of the former were regarded as an honour, and it is probable that Felltham did make an ineffectual protest against the appropriations of the latter.

It is to be expected that prose writers would borrow more readily from the *Resolves* than the poets; yet, the most interesting use of them was made by a poet. Professor L. C. Martin has pointed out several parallels between the poems of Henry Vaughan and the *Resolves*.³ As a translator Vaughan was quick to realize the merits of the English versions that Felltham appended to his quotations from the Classics.⁴ The only borrowing of this kind not recorded by Professor Martin is in *Olor Iscanus, De Ponto*, lib. 4^o, Eleg. 3^a, lines 53-58:⁵

All that we hold, hangs on a slender twine
And our best states by sudden chance decline;
Who hath not heard of *Cræsus* proverb'd gold
Yet knowes his foe did him a pris'ner hold?
He that once aw'd *Sicilia's* proud Extent
By a poor art could famine scarce prevent;

¹ n.d. ent. 26 May 1623.

² On 23 February 1667/8. See Jean Robertson, 'Owen Felltham of Great Billing', *Notes and Queries*, CLXXIII, no. 22 (27 November 1937) and Fred S. Tupper, 'New facts regarding Owen Felltham', *Modern Language Notes*, LIV (March 1939).

³ *The Works of Henry Vaughan*, ed. L. C. Martin (1914).

⁴ Felltham justified this practice in his address *To the Reader* in the second edition of the *Resolves*: 'The next is, for the Poetry, wherein,

indeed, I have beene strict, yet would be full. In my opinion, they disgrace our Language that will not give a Latine Verse his English, under two for one. I confesse, the Latine (besides the curiosnesse of the Tongue) hath in every Verse, the advantage of three or foure Syllables; yet if a man will labour for't, hee may turne it as short, and I beleeeve, as full. And for this some late Translations are my prooffe.'

⁵ *The Works of Henry Vaughan*, ed. L. C. Martin, I, 69.

from *Resolves*, I, 49, *That all things have a like progression and fall*.¹

All that *man* holds, hangs but by slender twine,
By sudden chance the strongest things decline.

and *Resolves*, I, 46, *Of the Waste and change of Time*:

Who has not heard of *Cræsus* heapes of *Gold*,
Yet knowes his *Foe* did him a prisoner hold?
He that once aw'd *Sycilias* proud extent,
By a poore *Art*, could *Famine* scarce prevent.

Only once, when drawing on the *Resolves*, does Vaughan announce that he is quoting, or pay any sort of tribute to Felltham (though not by name); in the preface to *Silex Scintillans* there occurs a passage based on Felltham's essay *Of Idle Bookes* introduced by the remark 'It was wisely considered, and piously said by one, That he would read no idle books'.² Far more interesting than any direct quotations from the *Resolves* in Prefaces, or in the translations, are the traces of Felltham's influence to be discerned in Vaughan's original poems. Once again I refer the reader to Professor Martin's notes for examples of this debt.

Felltham's influence was most marked on the semi-religious essayists such as Arthur Warwick, Joseph Henshaw³ and Bishop Beveridge. John Hewytt seems to have embroidered one of his sermons with phrases adapted from the *Resolves*.⁴ Hewytt combined religious fervour with a liking for conceits and strange words: he speaks of the face of the day as 'benegroed' over by the night. The Earl of Manchester, who plagiarizes Felltham in *Al Mondo*, may be classed with these writers; in form and subject-matter *Al Mondo* or *Contemplations of Death and Immortality* resembles William Drummond's *The Cypress Grove*. It enjoyed an immense popularity in the seventeenth century, being first published in 1631, and reaching its fifteenth edition in 1688, at which date it was described in the preface as a very suitable gift for funeral guests in place of the customary black kid gloves. During the nineteenth century there were several reprints, and the gravity and loftiness of the style have been uniformly praised. That *Al Mondo* is in reality a mosaic of sentences culled from such varied sources as the Bible, classical authors, Bacon's *Essayes* and Felltham's *Resolves* has not prevented all the credit going to

¹ This, and all subsequent quotations, are taken from the 6th edition (1636).

² See *The Works of Henry Vaughan*, ed. L. C. Martin, II, 694.

³ Cf. *Resolves*, II, 1, *Of Idle Bookes*: 'So I become guiltie by receiving, and he by thus conveying this lewdnesse unto me: He is the thiefe, and I the receiver; and what difference makes our Law betwixt them?' and Henshaw, *Horae Successivae*, vol. I, p. 6: 'If I cannot stop others mouthes I will stop my owne eares. The receiver is as bad as the thiefe.'

⁴ Cf. *Resolves*, I, 58, *That no man alwayes sinnes unpunisht*: 'Whereas if he (Joseph) had coap'd with his *Inticer*, 'tis like he might have swamme in *Gold*, and liv'd a laping to the *silke* and *dainties*', and Hewytt, *Last Sermons* (1658), *Sermon II*: 'You must not stream out your Youth in Wine, and live a Laping to the Silk and Dainties.' And cf. also *Resolves*, I, 22: '*Infatuated estate of Man!* That the injoyment of a pleasure,

must diminish it: That perpetuall use must make it, like a *Piramide*, lessening it selfe by degrees, till it growes at last to a *punctum*, to a nothing', and Hewytt, *Sermon II*: 'The whole world is not able to satisfie their ambition, but the aspiring Pyramid of their thoughts mounteth and lesseneth by degrees, till it come to a meer *punctum*.' The *N.E.D.* cites Felltham as the authority for *punctum*. Cf. also Hewytt, *Sermon III*: 'here is the *punctum* or centre, above which the circumference of our thoughts doth move.... All our vertues do centre in this *punctum*.' Hewytt, *Sermon II*: 'O man, thou that art an aery bubble, why art thou proud? Thou that art a bubble that is made of nothing, and when made, as soon blown to nothing', may be an elaboration of *Resolves*, I, 47, 'O what a bubble, what a puffe, what but a winke of life is man.' The 'hilling up of fatal gold' in *Sermon II* is found also in *Resolves*, I, 32.

the Earl of Manchester. Sometimes the *Resolves* are only drawn on for a pleasing sentence:

He that dies daily, seldom dies dejectedly.¹

Al Mondo—The second step, to be dying daily

Degreeingly to grow to greatness is the course of the world.²

Al Mondo—To dye by little and little

The houses of the dead, and the urned bones do meet with foul hands, for this nature hath provided...³

Al Mondo—The Souls Excellency

Some can as willingly leave the world, as others can forbear the Court.⁴

Al Mondo—Body and soul parting

At other times Manchester uses a longer passage—paraphrasing or reproducing according to his fancy. It is to be expected that he should have turned first to Felltham's essays on death, and it is equally natural that, having had recourse to them, he should have glanced at the other essays. Two examples will suffice to illustrate this method of composition:

There is no *Spectacle* more profitable, or more terrible, than the sight of a dying man... man by death is absolutely divided and disman'd. That grosse object which is left to the spectatours eyes; is now onely a composure but of the two baser Elements, water, and Earth: that now it is these two only, that seeme to make the body, while the two purer, Fire and Ayre, are wing'd away.

Resolves, I, 47, Of Death

There is no spectacle in the world so profitable, or more terrible, than to behold a dying man; to stand by, and see a man dismanned... but to see those Elements which, compounded, made the body: to see them divided and the man dissolved, is a rufull sight. So dependent is the life of Man, that it cannot want one Element; Fire and Air, these fly upward; Water and Earth, these sink downwards.

Al Mondo—For the manner of dying

Epicurus makes it a *Spirit*, mixt of fire and ayre... some, a self-moving number;... But for all these, I could never meete with any, that could give it so in an absolute Definition, that another or himselfe could conceive it.

Resolves, I, 64, Of the Soule

Some will haue it a *spirit* mixt of fire and air; Others a self-moving number;... Never any could give it such a definition, that either another or himselfe could conceive it.

Al Mondo—The Souls Excellency

The numerous passages borrowed from the *Resolves* in the works of Richard Younge, the puritan pamphleteer, would be surprising were it not for Younge's omnivorous appetite for borrowings. Felltham was not frantically opposed to the Puritans; he took the sensible line that there were good and bad Puritans, and the good he would love 'immutably'. Younge cannot have been in accord with all the things that Felltham said in *Resolves, I, 5, Of Puritans*: however, he used this essay in *Sinne Stigmatized*:

One will have him [the Puritan] one that lives religiously, and will not revell it in a shorelesse excesse.

Resolves, I, 5, Of Puritans

...where he shall be scofft at, and called Puritane, if he will not revell it with them in a shorelesse excesse.

Sinne Stigmatized, 68

¹ 'He that dyes daily, seldome dyes dejectedly.' *Resolves, II, 5, Three things aggravate a Misery.*

² 'Degreeingly to grow to greatnesse, is the course that he [God] hath left for Man.' *Resolves, I, 97, That 'tis best increasing by a little at once.*

³ 'The houses of the dead, and the urned bones,

haue sometimes met with rude hands, that have scattered them.' *Resolves, I, 46, Of the waste and change of time.*

⁴ 'Some, that can as gladly leave this World, as the wise man, being old, can forbear the Court.' *Resolves, I, 13, Of mans unwillingnesse to dye.*

It is rather difficult to identify Younge's pamphlets as he was continually changing their titles: *Sinne Stigmatized* had appeared in 1638 as *The Drunkard's Character* under the pseudonym Younge often used, 'R. Junius'. His first long pamphlet, which appeared in 1637, was entitled 'A Counterpoyson: or, soverain antidote against all grieffe. As also, the Benefit of Affliction; and how to Husband it so, that the weakest Christian (with blessing from above) may be able to support himself in his most miserable Exigents. Together with the Victory of Patience. Extracted out of the choicest Authors, Ancient and Moderne, both Holy and Humane, Necessary to be read of all that suffer any tribulation.' As will be seen from the title, Younge did not claim that *Counterpoyson* was an original work: in the preface to the enlarged second edition of 1641 he explained his method of compiling a book with a metaphor from the *Resolves*:

Wee feed not the *body*, with the food of one *dish* onely; nor does the *sedulous Bee*, *thyme* all her *thighes* from one *Flowers* single vertues. Shee takes the best from *many*; and together she makes them serve: not without working that to *Honey*, which the *putrid Spider* would convert to *poyson*. *Resolves*, I, 12

Wherefore I have added to the former selected flowers, as many more, whence any sedulous Bee may loade himselfe with Hony . . . to the Ingenuious Reader, that sucks Hony from the selfe same flower which the Spider doth poyson.¹

Counterpoyson, To the Reader

The apology for the deficiencies of the book is also couched in Felltham's words:

Nothing in this *World* can bee framed so entirely perfect, but that it shall have in it, some *delinquencies*, to argue more were in the *comprisor*. *Resolves*, I, 43

No humane action can be framed so perfect, but it shall have some delinquencies; to prove that more were in the Comprisor. *Counterpoyson, To the Reader*

The whole text of *Counterpoyson*, a patchwork quilt made out of other men's work, is riddled with passages taken from the *Resolves*. For example, three *Resolves* go to the making of one passage in Section XIX:

Neglect will kill an *injury*, sooner than *Revenge*. . . One told *Chrysippus* that his friend reproached him *privately*. Sayes he, *Aye*, but chide him not, for then he will doe as much in *publike*. *Resolves*, I, 78

As for the *crackers* of the *brain*, and *tongue-squibs*, they will *dye* alone, if I shall not *revive* them. The best way to have them *forgotten* by others, is first to *forget* them my selfe. *Resolves*, I, 2

When the *passenger* gallops by, as if his *feare* made him *speedy*, the *Curre* followes him with an open mouth, and *swiftnesse*: let him *walke* by, in a *confident neglect*; and the *Dogge* will never stirre at him. *Resolves*, I, 72

And this made *Chrysippus*, when one complained to him, that his friend had reproached him *privately*: answer, Ah, but chide him not, for then he will do as much in *publike*. Neglect will sooner kill an *injury*, than *Revenge*. These *tongue-squibs* or *crackers* of the *braine* will *die* alone, if we *revive* them not: the best way to have them *forgotten* by others, is first to *forget* them *ourselves*. Yea, to *contemne* an enemy, is better than either to *feare* him, or *answer* him. When the *Passenger* gallops by, as if his *fear* made him *speedy*, the *Cur* followes him with *open mouth* and *swiftnesse*; let him *turne* to the *brawling Cur*, and he will be *more fierce*; but let him ride by in a *confident neglect*, and the *Dog* will never stir at him, or at least will soon give over and be *quiet*.

Counterpoyson, Section XIX

¹ Cf. 'there is no cheating, like the Felonie of Wit; He which theeves that, robs the Owner, and coozens those that heare him.' *Resolves*, I, *To the Reader*; and 'I see many make use of your lines, few acknowledge, none return to give thanks;

but no cheating like the felony of wit; for he which thieves that, robs the owner, and coosens all that heare him', *Sinne Stigmatized, Dedication*.

Richard Younge's literary procedure evidently evoked some protest from the men whose works he had purloined in *Counterpoysion* without acknowledgement. *Sinne Stigmatized*, published in the following year (1638), is dedicated to the Bishop of Exeter, with an admission of guilt, and an apology for borrowing from his Lordship's works. The Dedication begins with righteous indignation, helped out with a phrase from Felltham's preface to the second edition of the *Resolves*.¹ With incorrigible cheerfulness Younge admits that

So have I (under correction) filch't from your Lordships worthy Workes, and other Authors, (both divine and humane, whether Ancients or Neotericks) whatsoeuer elegant Phrases, pithy Sentences, curious Metaphors, witty Apophthegmes, sweet similitudes, or Rhetoricall expressions I could meet withall pertinent, wholesome and delectable.

In fact, as Younge goes on to say, he has only provided the thread to bind his borrowings together. In his defence, he declares that he is only doing what some modern writers do with the Ancients;² and further,

I am no thiefe in it since I either say, or am ready to acknowledge of whom I had them. I have so made use of other mens wits as you may see I doe not steale but borrow.³

Felltham might have retorted that Younge never says from whom he is borrowing, and his being ready to make acknowledgement was not much satisfaction, especially as he goes on to admit that he has really forgotten where he did find most of his borrowings: anyway, his authors 'were all, or almost all, so famous that they name themselves': and finally, why inquire who wrote a sentence, so long as you enjoy and profit by reading it? One might reply to Younge's plea that 'such as want stock of their own are forced to borrow', that the uninventive should not attempt to write books. But he would be ready with his reply that his object (the lashing of vice) forced him to publish: and, still more unanswerably, that he liked doing it.

Sinne Stigmatized ('which may also serve for a commonplace booke of the most usuall vertues and vices: or as a repository of rhetoricall figures and formes of speech') is just the same medley that we find in *Counterpoysion*. Felltham is responsible for the bulk of the imagery. *Sinne Stigmatized* was first published as *The Drunkard's Character*, and is chiefly concerned with the castigation of drunkenness: hence we would expect to find Felltham's essay *Of Drunkennesse* being useful. His description of a drunkard only needs a little working up to make it sufficiently revolting for Younge's purpose:

What a Monster Man is, in his inebriations! a swimming Eye; a Face, both roast and sod; a temulentine Tongue, clammed to the rooffe and gummies; a drumming Eare; a feavered Bodie; a boyling Stomacke; a Mouth nastie with offensive fumes; till it sicken the Braine with giddie verminations; a palsied Hand; and Legges tottering up and downe their moistened Burthen.

Resolves, I, 84

The Drunkard commonly hath (*Vertumnus* like) a brasill Nose, a swolne and inflamed Face; beset with goodly Chowles and Rubies, as if it were both rost and sod; swimming, running, glaring gogle Eyes, bleared, rowling and red; a Mouth nasty with offensive fumes, alwayes foaming or driveling; a fevorish Body; a sickie and giddy Braine, a Mind disperst; a boyling stomacke; rotten Teeth; a stinking Breath; a drumming Eare; a palsied Hand; gouty, staggering legs, that faine would goe, but cannot; a drawling, stammering, temulentine Tongue, clamb'd to the rooffe and gummies.

Sinne Stigmatized, Section xv

themselves doe with Ancient Writers.' *Sinne Stigmatized*, To the Reader.

³ Cf. 'I have so used them, as you, may see I doe not steale, but borrow.' *Resolves*, To the Reader.

¹ v. p. 111, n. 1.

² 'Observation. But you make over-bold in reaping that which other men bestowed the labour to sowe.' *Answer*. No bolder with Neotericks and Moderne Writers, then even

There are traces of the *Resolves* in *Cordial Councell* (1644), and in *Cure of Misprision* (1646): but in his later and shorter pamphlets Younge did not have recourse to the *Resolves* nearly so frequently. Possibly Felltham found some effective means to stop his pillaging.

John Gadsbury, a noted astrologer, wanted his works to be read by the clergy and by cultured people generally. To this end, he strove to combine a belief in fate governed by the stars with a belief in orthodox Christianity. He was not alone in this attempt; many prominent divines of the day dabbled in astrology. Felltham was not, on the whole, favourably inclined to the art: it was, he declared, neglected by the wiser sort because we can only foretell ill, and what is the good of doing that? His arguments against the efficacy of astrological calculations reveal acquaintance with the technical jargon:

And indeed, the minute of *Generation, Conception, and Production*, are so hard to know justly; the *Point of place* so hard to finde: the *Angles, the Aspects, and the Conjunctions* of the *Heavens* so impossible to bee cast right in their *influences*, by reason of the *rapid and Lightning-like Motion* of the *Spheares*; that the whole *Art*, thorowly searched and examined, will appeare a meere *fallacie and delusion* of the *wits of Men*. If their *Calculations* bee from the seven *Motive Spheares* onely, how is there such difference in the lives of *Children* borne together, when their oblique *motion* is so slow, as the *Moone*, (though farre more speedy than any of the rest) is yet above seven and twenty dayes in her *course*? If their *calculations* be by their *diurnall Motion*, it is impossible to collect the *various influences*, which every tittle of a *minute* gives: Besides, in close *Roomes*, where the *Windowes* are clozed, the *Fire, Perfumes, concourse* of *People*, and the *parentall humours*, barre their operation from the *Child*.

Resolves, I, 96, *Of Divination*

Felltham concludes by supposing that it might be possible to foretell *general inclinations*, but not *particular events*. There is nothing to encourage an ardent astrologer in this essay. But Gadsbury did not go to the *Resolves* for astrology: he liked his pamphlets to have a literary flavour, and to this end he embellished them with quotations from Quarles, Henry More, Caryl, Sir Thomas Browne and others. In *London's Deliverance Predicted* (1665), Gadsbury sought to prove, by reference to astrology, that the end of the Plague was at hand. He devoted considerable space to proving, with some acrimony and little respect for those of the opposite opinion, that the Plague was not contagious; and therefore it was not only cowardly, but also futile to flee from London in the hope of escaping infection. Gadsbury's arguments against cowardice are strengthened by quotations from Felltham's essays *Of Fear and Cowardice* and *Of Fate*. In the longest passage only does Gadsbury indicate that he is using the words of another:

And *valour* (as one well observes) casts a kind of honour upon God, in that we shew, that we believe his *goodness*, while we trust our selves in *danger* upon his care onely; whereas the *Coward eclipses* his sufficiency, by unworthily *doubting* that God will not bring him off.¹

London's Deliverance Predicted, VI, 31

On the same page, sentences from this essay and from another appear without acknowledgement:

In a *Battell* wee see the *valiant man* escape oft safe, by a *constant* keeping his *ranke*; when the *Coward*, shifting dangers, runnes by *avoyding one*, into the severall *walkes* of many.

Resolves, I, 71, *Of Fear and Cowardice*

¹ Cf. *Resolves*, I, 71: 'And indeed *valour* casts a kinde of *honour* upon *God*; in that we shew that we beleve his *goodnesse*, while we trust our selves in *danger*, upon his care onely: Whereas the *Coward* eclipses his sufficiency, by *unworthily doubting*, that *God* will not bring him off.' A later

sentence 'For when man mistrusts *God*, 'tis just "with *God* to leave *Man*," is paraphrased on the same page of *London's Deliverance Predicted*: 'If *men* will be afraid to trust *God*, it is no wonder that he refuses to protect them.'

Our owne wit often hunts us into the snares, that above all things we would shunne.

Resolves, I, 79, *Of Fate*

Cowards hoping to avoid dangers, rush ignorantly into them. A Bullet may sooner kill him that runs from the battle, then him that stoutly and resolutely joyns therewith; the truly valiant often escape untoucht. A man's own wit (when bridled by fear) hunts him into those snares, that above all things he would gladly shun.

London's Deliverance Predicted, p. 31

There is one example of plagiarism from the *Resolves* as late as 1718. Readers of *The Entertainer: containing Remarks upon Men, Manners, Religion and Policy*, published serially during 1717 and 1718, were unwittingly entertained with excerpts from the *Resolves*. *The Entertainer* was not, in all probability, the work of one man, and the *Resolves* are only used in certain papers. Nevertheless, one feels that the *Remarks upon Men, Manners, Religion and Policy* are modernized *Resolves Divine, Moral and Political*. At all events, one writer on the staff of *The Entertainer*, being rather short of his own coin, was lucky enough to hit on a copy of the *Resolves*; and relied on the obscurity of their author to prevent the discovery of his theft. He used one of the quarto editions (the last was published in 1647): he was, perhaps, unaware that a final edition of the revised *Resolves* was published in 1709. In Paper XII, *Resolves*, II, I and I, 57, furnish the material for a combined passage;¹ and a similar use is made of two *Resolves* in Paper XV.² This Paper also contains an expansion of a few lines in *Resolves*, I, 25:

No willing Sinne was ever in the Act displeasing. Yet, is it not sooner past, than distastfull: though pleasure merries the Sences for a while: yet horrorr after vultures the unconsuming heart.

Resolves, I, 25

...however pleasing and delightful they may seem in the Prosecution, are always bitter and distasteful in the End: They entail certain Misery on the Actors themselves, and very often on their Posterity. They may captivate the senses, gratify the Affections, and wrap the Soul into a Fool's Paradise for a while: but no sooner shall the Enjoyment be over, when Horrorr will seize upon the Vitals, and act the Promethean vulture upon the unconsuming Conscience.

The Entertainer, xv

In Paper XIX the writer is again indebted to the *Resolves*:

Such effects workes Poetry, when it lookes to towring Vertues. It gives up a man to raptures; and irradiates the soule, with such high apprehensions: that all the Glories, which this World hath, hereby appeare, contemptible.

Resolves, I, 14

Divinity well ordered, casts forth a Baite, which angles the Soule onto the eare: and how can that cloze, when such a guest sits in it?... A good Orator should pierce the eare, allure the eye, and invade the minde of his hearer. And this is Seneca's opinion: Fit words are better than fine ones:...'Tis much moving in an Orator, when the Soule seemes to speake, as well as the tongue.

Resolves, I, 20, *Of Preaching*

'Tis moving in an Orator when the Soul seems to speak as well as the Tongue; such Preaching melts us into Rapture, and irradiates the Understanding with high and Heavenly conceptions of Bliss and Glory: That the World and its glittering Pomp appears foolish and contemptible... If we consider their Discourses [preachers of the last

¹ Cf. *Resolves*, II, I: 'A lame Hand is better than a lewd Pen... a foolish sentence dropt upon paper, sets folly on a Hill, and is a Monument to make infamie eternall', and *Resolves*, I, 57: 'Tis [ill company] like a Ship new trimmed, wheresoever you but touch, it soyles you'; with *The Entertainer*, XII: 'Recommend me rather to a lame Hand, than a Lewd Pen: such Compositions may be compar'd to a Ship new trimm'd, the least Touch do's smear and defile 'em. A foolish Sentence dropt upon Paper, may sometimes fix

Folly upon an Hill, and raise an eternal Monument for Infamy.'

² Cf. *Resolves*, II, 34: 'Vice is a Peripateticke, alwayes in Progression', and *Resolves*, II, 24: 'He that lives in noted sinnes, is a false Lanthorne, which shipwrackes those that trust him', with *The Entertainer*, xv: 'Vice is a Peripateticke in its Progression... 'Tis a false Lanthorn, which leads the Mariners upon Rocks and Shelves; and they that trust it can never escape.'

century] we shall find in them a *Quick* strength, a *Round* Brevity and an *Elegant* Purity, becoming the *Holy* Doctrine they promulge; their *Sense* nervous, their *Sentences* well turn'd, and their *Points* piercing; and fit *Words* always preferr'd to fine ones. *Divinity* thus dress'd up angles the *Soul* into the *Organ* of *Hearing*; and how can that be clos'd up when such a guest is enshrin'd in it? *The Entertainer*, XIX

The *Resolves* do not appear again until Paper XLII in which *Resolves*, II, 63:

Envie, like the *Worme*, never runnes but to the fairest and ripest fruit: as a cunning *Bloud-hound*, it singles out the fattest *Deere* of the herd: 'tis a *pitchy smoake*, which wheresoever we finde, wee may bee sure there is a *fire of Vertue*. . . being bad, and shallow himselfe, he would damme up the *streame*, that is *sweet*, and *silent*: so by envying another, for his *radiant lustre*, he gives the *World* notice, how *darke* and *obscure* he is him selfe. . . 'tis onely the *weake sighted*, that cannot endure the *light*:

is boiled over rather than boiled down into

Envy, like a Worm, never runs but to the fairest and the ripest Fruit; like a cunning and well nosed Blood-Hound, it singles out the stateliest and fattest Deer of all the Herd; 'tis true it is a Pitchy-smoak, and wheresoever it curls and spires, there we may be sure to find the radiant fire of Virtue. Weak Opticks cannot endure the light, and those that are bad and shallow themselves endeavour to damm up the Stream that is transparent and serene; and by striving to obscure another's lustre, they alarm the World how dark a Hue they are themselves.

Whether this writer felt that he had exhausted Felltham's possibilities, or whether he left the staff of *The Entertainer*, this is the last time that the *Resolves* are used in that paper: and it is also the last time that another writer is found deliberately borrowing from Felltham. His influence waned in the eighteenth century: in 1734 appeared John Constable's *Reflections upon Accuracy of Style*. The author's main object was to animadvert on the style of an author disguised by the pseudonym *Callicrates*. In two places, Callicrates's style is ridiculed by likening it to passages from the *Resolves*. The image with which *Resolves*, I, 62 begins, 'Every *Man* is a vast and *spacious Sea*', is quoted as an example of an over-long metaphor, and Felltham's style is condemned as being 'too artificial to last'. Yet Dr Johnson cites Felltham several times with approval in his *Dictionary*. The nineteenth-century articles and editions bear witness to a revival of interest; and, if we may rely upon the statement of J. Cumming,¹ nineteenth-century clergymen (including Bishop Newton in his *Practical Dissertations*) were in the habit of quoting the *Resolves* in their sermons.

JEAN ROBERTSON

LIVERPOOL

¹ See Introduction to his edition of the *Resolves* (1800 and 1820).

HEATHCLIFF'S COUNTRY

When I first read *Wuthering Heights* I was very curious about the mysterious country from which Heathcliff came, and into which he sometimes disappeared. I felt that it was not a mere writer's trick for avoiding tiresome explanations, but that there was some definite imaginative creation behind it. By and by I found that the clue was the imaginary kingdoms which the Brontës invented for themselves as children, with which they 'played', as they themselves called it, all the rest of their short lives. I first discovered Emily's kingdom of Gondal when I read *The Complete Poems of Emily Brontë*, edited by Clement Shorter with an introductory essay by W. Robertson Nicoll, published in 1910. In this edition very few of the Gondal names and headings are given, and a number of poems by Charlotte, Branwell and Anne are included as Emily's, but at the time I was not aware of this, and a paper of mine on *Gondaland* was published in the *M.L.R.* in 1923, which was proved to be very incorrect by the appearance in the same year of *The Complete Poems of Emily Jane Brontë*, edited by Clement Shorter, arranged and collated, with Bibliography and Notes, by C. W. Hatfield. In this the wrong attributions and more obvious mistakes of the previous volume were corrected, and the editor of the *M.L.R.* was kind enough to publish in October 1926 another paper of mine in correction of the first.

Since then my theories about Gondal have been altered by the publication of *Gondal Poems by Emily Jane Brontë, now first published from the MS. in the British Museum*, edited by . . . Helen Brown and Joan Mott, 1938. The most recent re-editing of the poems is *The Complete Poems of Emily Jane Brontë*, edited from the Manuscripts by C. W. Hatfield, 1941. The references in the following paper are to this, in which all the most recent research into Emily Brontë's poems is incorporated. *The Complete Poems of Anne Brontë*, edited by C. Shorter with a bibliographical introduction by C. W. Hatfield, 1920, also gives some useful information about Gondal. Anne wrote poems about the imaginary country which was the joint creation of herself and Emily. One point that emerges from Anne's contribution is that Gondal, a large island in the North Pacific, was divided into two kingdoms, Exina and Angora, at one period of its history. Perhaps at first Exina was Anne's kingdom and Angora Emily's, as Exina is only named in Anne's poems, and Angora only in Emily's. But Gondal was Emily's country far more than it was Anne's, and her powerful imagination soon took possession of the whole. Anne had the good sense and good taste to value Gondal for the sake of Emily's creations; her own interest in the game does not seem to have been very great.

The most recent account of Gondal is contained in Miss Fannie Elizabeth Ratchford's interesting and careful book *The Brontës' Web of Childhood*, 1941. Miss Ratchford has also contributed a preliminary section to C. W. Hatfield's new edition of the poems, in which she gives a reconstruction of 'the epic of Gondal'.

All the four Brontë children at first contributed to the history of the same imaginary land, called Angria, but naturally the two younger girls had very little say in its development in comparison with the elder brother and sister, and in 1832, when Emily was fifteen, she and Anne renounced all their share in the original country, and began one of their own, which they called Gondal. Like Branwell and Charlotte they wrote prose histories and biographies of the inhabitants of this land, but all their prose works have vanished, and only their poems remain. The history

of Gondal is therefore much more conjectural than that of the countries of Branwell and Charlotte.

Miss Ratchford is sensible and matter of fact, invaluable qualities in anyone writing about the Brontës, but they make her less at home in dealing with Gondal than she is with the fully documented kingdom of Angria. The interpretation of many Gondal poems is guess-work, and where there is so little to go upon the guess of a person so familiar with the Brontës as Miss Ratchford is more likely to be correct than the guess of anyone else, but she is rather too much inclined to attach an objective reality to the imaginary kingdoms, as if Charlotte or Emily was writing a history of a real country, which could be checked by facts. In exposing the folly of those people who—to take an extreme case—argue that Emily must have had an illegitimate baby and abandoned it on Haworth moor, because she wrote *The Outcast Mother*, Miss Ratchford rules out any personal references at all from the Gondal poems. But these imaginary countries are part of the mental make-up of their creators. They have no independent existence. To say that a poem about Gondal is not about Emily is as great an exaggeration in the opposite direction as to say that the events of the poem must have happened to her. Gondal was even more essentially a part of herself than a novel is of its writer, for a novelist attempts to represent the outside world as both she and her readers see it, but Gondal was a world imagined to suit no one but Emily herself.

When one of the Gondal headings does not fit in with her interpretation, Miss Ratchford even goes so far as to say that Emily must have made a mistake! No satisfactory interpretation of the poems can be made except by taking Emily's own notes upon them as unalterable data. Nobody has ever known anything about the Gondal country except Emily and Anne Brontë, who have been dead for nearly a hundred years. For anyone living now to profess to know more about it than they did themselves is an impossible assumption. We must accept Emily's Gondal notes as fundamental, and if any theory comes in conflict with them, it is the theory that must be scrapped, not the note.

It would be unbecoming and wearisome for me to argue in detail about Miss Ratchford's interpretation of the history of Gondal, but I should like to put my own theory briefly, merely mentioning where it differs from hers.

Gondal was a large island in the North Pacific, divided into two kingdoms, Exina in the south and Angora in the north. The capital city was Regina, which probably, but not certainly, lay in Exina. Another large island, Gaaldine, lay in the South Pacific, several weeks' sailing from Gondal. Anne Brontë wrote into her geography book the names of the kingdoms into which Gaaldine was divided: Alexandria, Almadore, Elseradon, Zalona, Ula, which was governed by four sovereigns and seems to have been an archipelago, and Zedora, a large province governed by a viceroy. Zedora and Ula were tropical, but the rest of Gaaldine was much like Gondal in climate and landscape, and the inhabitants were on the same level of culture as the Gondalians; there is no mention of savages or heathen.

The chief character in the Gondal poems is Augusta, apparently queen of Exina. Her initials are A. G. A., of which the first name is undoubtedly Augusta, and the last Almeda (Alaisda in the 1923 edition); G. probably but not certainly stands for Geraldine. Between 1836 and 1846 Emily wrote at least one poem about A. G. A. every year; her initials are more frequent than those of any other Gondal character and many poems to which they are not attached probably relate to her.

Emily sometimes wrote a number of scraps of disconnected verse on one sheet, which seem to be experiments for a longer poem that was never written. Her

earliest dated MS., 16 July 1836, seems to give such an outline of a poem on the childhood of Augusta. In the first verse, 'Cold, clear and blue' (no. 1), she perhaps places her heroine's birthday in winter, but in the other fragments it is in summer. In 'Will the day be bright or cloudy' (no. 2) a lady consults a soothsayer about the future of her first-born child, a girl, probably Augusta. It seems to be the girl's birthday, not, of course, the very day on which she was born, for then her mother would not be able to consult a prophet, but one of her early birthdays. The soothsayer tells the lady to observe the weather of this significant day. It has dawned sweetly; if it is fine, warm and misty, the child's life will be tranquil, like a pleasant dream; if it turns to darkness and rain, her life will pass in tears and care; if the wind is fresh and the skies clear, her days will pass in Glory's light. Another fragment is a dialogue in three verses ('Tell me, tell me, smiling child', no. 3) between someone and a happy child who foresees a glorious future. The sex of the speakers is not mentioned, but it might be a conversation between the lady who was inquiring about her daughter's future and the child herself. In the final fragment ('The inspiring music's thrilling sound', no. 4) a festal day has just ended, and its glittering splendour is unheeded by a lady who, hiding her tears, hurries along dim galleries through which murmurs 'The night-wind's lonely vesper-hymn'. This again might be the same lady, Augusta's mother, at the end of the day, when the fair sky had been overshadowed by a storm.

The story of Augusta is most fully told in a poem of about 400 lines, the longest that Emily ever wrote, which in *Gondal Poems* is rather quaintly called 'A. G. A., The Death of' (no. 143). It is of course printed in all the collections of her poems, but in the new edition there are some significant corrections in the usual text, taken from the *Gondal Poems* MS. This poem tells us that Augusta was brought up with a girl called Angelica. Here I part company with Miss Ratchford, who thinks that Angelica came into Augusta's life at a later period, but as Augusta was her 'childhood's mate', I take it that they were playmates in childhood. These are the verses in which Angelica tells her story to Douglas, who has been pleading, for her love:

Listen! I've known a burning heart,
 To which my own was given;
 Nay, not with passion; do not start:
 Our love was love from heaven;
 At least, if heaven's love be born
 In the pure light of childhood's morn,—
 Long ere the poison-tainted air
 From this world's plague-fen rises there.
 That heart was like a tropic sun
 That kindles all it shines upon;
 And never Magian devotee
 Gave worship half so warm as I;
 And never radiant bow could be
 So welcome in a stormy sky.
 My soul dwelt with her day and night:
 She was my all-sufficing light,
 My childhood's mate, my girlhood's guide,
 My only blessing, only pride.
 But cursed be the very earth
 That gave that fiend her fatal birth!
 With her own hand she bent the bow
 That laid my best affections low;
 Then mocked my grief and scorned my prayers,
 And drowned my bloom of youth in tears.

Warnings, reproaches,—both were vain:
 What recked she of another's pain?
 My dearer self she would not spare;
 From Honour's voice she turned his ear:
 First made her love his only stay,
 Then snatched the treacherous prop away.
 Douglas, he pleaded bitterly;
 He pleaded as you plead to me,
 For lifelong chains or timeless tomb,
 Or any but an exile's doom.
 We both were scorned, both sternly driven
 To shelter 'neath a foreign heaven;
 And darkens o'er that dreary time
 A 'wildering dream of frenzied crime.
 I would not now those days recall;
 The oath within that cavern'd hall,
 And its fulfilment: these you know,—
 We both together struck the blow,
 But you can never know the pain
 That my lost heart did then sustain,
 When, severed wide by guiltless gore,
 I felt that *one* could love no more!
 Back, maddening thought! the grave is deep
 Where my Amadeus lies asleep,—
 And I have long forgot to weep.

In the usual printed version of the poem, line four of the sixth verse quoted above reads 'From Honour's voice she turned her ear' instead of 'his ear', and the fourth line of the last verse is 'I felt that *one* could live no more!' instead of 'love no more'. From this reading it seemed that Amadeus and Angelica were either brother and sister or foster brother and sister, that Amadeus fell in love with Augusta, who promised to marry him, and that when Augusta tired of him, Angelica pleaded his cause and told her that she was bound in honour to keep her word. But the MS. reading gives a different story; there is nothing to indicate that Amadeus and Angelica were foster brother and sister, but they were in love and betrothed to one another, when Augusta took a fancy to Amadeus and beguiled him into breaking his word to Angelica. Then Augusta wearied of him, and banished both the friend she had wronged and the lover she had discarded to Gaaldine.

Emily sometimes wrote two poems telling the same story from the points of view of two different characters in it. In June and July 1837 she wrote two poems which seem to be connected in this way. The first, 'The night of storms is passed' (no. 12), is written in the first person and describes a terrible dream. The dreamer saw a ghastly shadow standing by a royal tomb, and heard a strange wailing issue from its lips. Three verses (no. 13) beginning

Woe for the day! Regina's pride,
 Regina's hope is in the grave:

may be the utterance of the spectre. The second, 'I saw thee, child, one summer day' (no. 14), is the utterance of a spirit of doom brooding over a happy, innocent boy, and revealing his terrible future to him in a dream. A third fragment, undated (no. 112), 'Sleep not, dream not; this bright day', is headed A. A. A. and is addressed by an unknown speaker to a beautiful and happy boy—

Too good for this world's warring wild;
 Too heavenly now, but doomed to be
 Hell-like, in heart and misery.

I guess, though it is only a guess, that this boy is Amadeus.

Augusta cast off Amadeus when she fell in love with Alexander lord of Elbë. He may be the boy in the poem 'Heavy hangs the rain-drop' which in the Gondal MS. is headed 'A. E. and R. C.' (no. 186). A. E. may be Alexander of Elbë, in which case he was the child of misfortune—

Never has his grim fate
Smiled since he was born.

R. C. is a golden-haired, blue-eyed girl, a 'child of delight', who comes to comfort him. These initials never appear again, and from the description it seems as if she was not a human being, but a supernatural good spirit, like the spirit who helps a lost traveller in 'The night was dark, yet winter breathed' (no. 95). It was Alexander's dark fate to marry Augusta.

The reason for supposing that Amadeus and Angelica were banished to Gaaldine is 'the oath within the cavern'd hall', for the prison caves of Gaaldine are mentioned elsewhere. Apparently one or more of the kingdoms of Gaaldine was a dependency of Exina, whether by conquest, colonization or alliance. Amadeus and Angelica escaped or were released from prison and stirred up a revolt against Exina in Gaaldine; this was the blow that they both together struck. Augusta and Alexander came to Gaaldine to quell the revolt, and there was a battle by Lake Elmor or Elnor in which Alexander was killed. This is one of the most important events in Gondal history, and there are a number of poems about it. The first in the book of Gondal Poems, 'There shines the moon, at noon of night' (6 March 1837, no. 9), gives Augusta's memory of the disaster long afterwards. In 'O Day! he cannot die!' (2 Dec. 1844, no. 180) she describes the scene at the time. There are six fragments written in August 1837, beginning 'The battle had passed from the height', which are evidently a sketch for a long poem on the battle (nos. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22). The last of these is significant:

Lady, in your palace hall,
Once perchance my face was seen;
Can no memory now recall
Thought again to what has been?

Amadeus must be finding Augusta beside the body of Alexander. The fragment 'Why do I hate that lone green dell' (9 May 1838, no. 60) with the initials A. G. A. refers to the same incident. Augusta met a noble foe who was at first full of cold and scornful pride, but his heart was softened by her distress; he comforted her, and for a little while she imagined that she might be a different woman, but

Before a day—an hour—passed by,
My spirit knew itself once more.

Amadeus and Angelica had as their ally Douglas, a desperate outlaw; he was the soldier who killed Alexander of Elbë, and while Augusta mourned by her husband's body, her troops were pursuing Douglas. The story is told as a song, with a few lines of setting evidently modelled on *The Lay of the Last Minstrel*, 'Well, narrower draw the circle round'. The song, *Douglas' Ride*, begins 'What rider up Gobelrin's glen' (11 July 1838, no. 75). Douglas rides into the heights of the mountains, followed by men 'Whose breasts have burst through the battle's worst'. Their leader encourages them:

Now, my bold men, this one pass more,
This narrow chasm of stone,
And Douglas for our sovereign's gore
Shall yield us back his own!

But Douglas dislodges a pine tree laid across the chasm; it falls on his pursuers and sweeps them away, and Douglas makes good his escape.

As Douglas murdered Augusta, both Miss Ratchford and myself at first naturally thought that this spirited poem described his escape after the murder. But this cannot be correct, as Augusta, a woman of her hands, gave him a fatal wound before he killed her, and his death is described at the end of the poem 'A. G. A., the Death of'. Also Augusta was killed on a lonely moor, not in battle. This therefore is an earlier exploit of Douglas; as Alexander was prince consort he would naturally be called 'sovereign' by his subjects.

Perhaps the loss of the men killed by Douglas's pine tree turned Augusta's victory into a defeat. At any rate we next find her a prisoner, probably in Gondal, not in Gaaldine. Her description of Alexander's death ('O Day! He cannot die', no. 180, 2 Dec. 1844) has the heading 'From a Dungeon Wall in the North College. A. G. A. Sept. 1826'. This Gondal date is particularly interesting. Emily began to write her Gondal poems in 1836, and from this date we see that she imagined Augusta as living about ten years before. The Brontës regarded all educational institutions as practically indistinguishable from prisons, and Emily anticipated modern slang by calling the prisons of Gondal colleges. The situation seems to be that when Exina was in difficulties with the rebels in Gaaldine, Angora took the opportunity to attack, in alliance with the rebels, and overran Augusta's kingdom. Many of her subjects were imprisoned or forced into exile, and the Queen was sent back from Gaaldine to Angora as a prisoner. In the winter of 1826, as we may suppose, Augusta wrote another poem 'To a Wreath of Snow' which had drifted into her prison cell ('O transient voyager of heaven', Dec. 1837, no. 39). Augusta, however, did not languish in prison long. The people of Exina rose against their conquerors, under the leadership of the family of Gleneden, about whom there are a number of poems; 'From our evening fireside now' 'by R. Glenden' (17 April 1839, no. 97) is a lament for Arthur Gleneden, a leader who was killed. There was a great battle, in which the losses on both sides were heavy, but in the end Exina won, drove out the rebels and the Angorans, and restored Augusta. The battle is celebrated in the poem 'The busy day has hurried by' (14 June 1839, no. 104), which has the heading 'written on returning to the P[alace] of I[nstruction] on the 10th of January 1827'. The Palace of Instruction is a survival from the very early kingdom of all the four children; Miss Ratchford gives the particulars in *The Brontës' Web of Childhood*, pp. 9-10.

Augusta went to Elbë, where she again lamented the loss of Alexander in 'Lord of Elbë, on Elbë Hill' (19 Aug. 1837, no. 16). This has the heading 'A. G. A. to A. E.' It has two alternative last verses, both given in the new edition. The one printed in previous collections is:

But thou art now on the desolate sea,
Thinking of Gondal and grieving for me;
Longing to be in sweet Elbë again;
Thinking and grieving and longing in vain.

But in some MSS. this has been altered to:

But thou art now on a desolate sea—
Parted from Gondal and parted from me—
All my repining is hopeless and vain,
Death never yields back his victims again.

It would seem from the first version that Alexander was alive but in exile, from the second that he was dead. I think, however, that both versions really refer to his death; Emily constantly used the sea as an emblem of death, and in a well-known passage in *Wuthering Heights* she pictures the dead longing to return to earth.

Perhaps she wrote the weaker second version to make the meaning of the poem perfectly clear. There are ten fragments dated June 1838, beginning 'Twas one of those dark, cloudy days' (nos. 65-74) and ending with five lines describing the hall of Elbë, 'Home of the departed, the long-departed dead', which seem to be the outline of a poem on Elbë Hall.

As Alexander had prophesied, Augusta recovered from her grief at his loss and fell in love again. Her new lover was a young musician, Fernando de Samara; he seems to have been of lower rank than her other suitors, as he is never called 'lord' and has no territorial designation. He was a foster child in a family consisting of a mother and daughter, who lived near an abbey on the edge of Areon forest, not far from the sea. The girl's Christian name is never mentioned, but she seems to have belonged to the family of Alcona. She fell deeply in love with him, though she was only fourteen; all the Gondolians were very precocious. Fernando pledged himself to her, but he sailed away over the sea. 'Now trust a heart that trusts to you' (Nov. 1837, no. 33) is probably his farewell. He wrote her one letter to say that his voyage had been prosperous, but she never heard from him again, and died of grief ten years later. All this is told in the dying girl's confession to her mother, 'O mother, I am not regretting' (14 Dec. 1837, no. 42). Probably Fernando was already dead. After he wrote his one letter home, the next incident of his career was his arrival at the court of Queen Augusta. He played his guitar and sang to her by Elderno Lake, singing the songs that he had made for his first love. She gave him a lock of her hair and a miniature inscribed with the words: 'Dearest, ever deem me true' (no. 25), but there was irony in this, for she wearied of him, and banished him to imprisonment in Gaaldine, just as she had done with Amadeus, without taking warning by her previous experience. Fernando, however, was not a practical soldier like Amadeus; his was the emotional, artistic temperament. In 'Thy sun is near meridian height' (6 Jan. 1840, no. 133) he poured out bitter reproaches against Augusta, and regrets for the love he had abandoned. This poem is headed 'F. de Samara written in the Gaaldine prison caves. To A. G. A.' In a gentler mood he thought with regret of his first love, whom he knew to be pining for him. The poem (no. 117, 6 Sept. 1839), which begins:

Alcona, in its changing mood
My soul will sometimes overfly
The long, long years of solitude
That 'twixt our time of meeting lie,

is printed here for the first time in a collected edition of the poems, though it has appeared in the *Publications of the Brontë Society*, part xlviii, 1937, in an article on 'The Gondal Saga' by Helen Brown and Joan Mott. The deserted girl who confessed her unhappy love to her mother (no. 42) lived at Areon. This poem, no. 117, is addressed to a girl who is pining for her lover at Areon, and it follows that it is probably addressed by Fernando to his first love. It is rather strange that he calls her by her family name, but this may be simply a question of metre; perhaps her Christian name was too short, like Mary, or too long, like Alexandrina.

Fernando at length escaped from prison, not, like Amadeus, to raise a rebellion, but only to commit suicide on a moor, holding Augusta's portrait in his hand. This moor is far away from Gondal, but there is nothing to show that it is in England, as Miss Ratchford suggests; Fernando seems to be in Gaaldine. His dying speech, 'Light up thy halls! 'Tis closing day' (1 Nov. 1838, no. 85) is headed 'F. de Samara to A. G. A.', and this is the heading which Miss Ratchford thinks is a mistake, but it seems to me inadmissible to correct Emily in this way, and the poem fits

logically into the story of Fernando. Perhaps 'It is too late to call thee now' (April 1840, no. 135) is the girl Alcona's epitaph on the faithless but still beloved Fernando.

The man who superseded Fernando in Augusta's fickle heart was Alfred Sidonia, lord of Aspin Castle. There are a number of poems to which the initials A. S. are attached, but it is not certain that he was the only person in Gondal with those initials. 'I do not weep; I would not weep' (19 Dec. 1841, no. 152) is headed 'A. S. to G. S.' In it a child, whose sex does not appear, comforts its brother Gerald for the death of their mother, who tenderly loved them, but now lies 'Mid heath and frozen snow'. It may be that these children were Alfred and Gerald Sidonia, and that their mother had a story which cannot now be identified.

The long poem *Aspin Castle* ('How do I love on summer nights', 6 Feb., 20 Aug. 1843, no. 154) gives a fuller account of Lord Alfred than we have of Augusta's other lovers, and yet it leaves many points uncertain. In the hall of Aspin Castle were three portraits, one of Lord Alfred, who was fair-haired and beautiful, next to him a little girl, his fair-haired daughter, an infant, very like him, and on the other side Augusta 'In all her glory, all her pride'. There is a hint of rivalry between Augusta and the baby girl. Lord Alfred neglected the child because he was infatuated with Augusta; this has suggested that the girl was perhaps the child of an earlier marriage. A poem beginning 'Where beams the sun the brightest' (1 May 1843, no 158) is headed 'To A. S.' with a Gondal date 1830. It is consolation to A. S. (whose sex does not appear) for the loss of a dearly loved woman who was drowned at sea. This might be Alfred Sidonia's first wife, the mother of the fair, neglected child. But there is nothing to explain the relationship between A. S. and the drowned girl, and another poem, to be mentioned presently, seems to imply that the fair child was Augusta's daughter.

Augusta expressed her passionate love for Alfred in 'At such a time, in such a spot' (6 May, 1840, 28 July 1843, no 137), headed 'A. G. A. to A. S.', but even in this poem there is a defiant note; she repudiates religion for the sake of love. Over their marriage hung a shadow of sin, on account of her ill-treatment of Fernando. Augusta protested earnestly that she alone was to blame, and that Alfred was perfectly innocent, but from *Aspin Castle* it appears that in the general opinion of her subjects Alfred was equally responsible with her; they believed his remorse was so great that his spirit could not rest in its grave.

There are two versions of one poem, 'I'm standing in the forest now', 'Thou standest in the greenwood now' (no date, no. 110); in this someone questions Augusta about the lover with whom she was once seen in the same place. 'Is he false to her, or is she false to him?' She replies that his heart is faithful in the grave, and that she loved him, but her present love is as much greater as the sun is greater than the moon. She finds Fernando's guitar, and though she is moved to tears, she feels that she no longer loves him ('For him who struck thy foreign string', 30 Aug. 1838, no. 76). Her miniature was long afterwards found on the moor where Fernando killed himself ('Long neglect has worn away', no date, no. 25). Perhaps it was these discoveries which finally showed Alfred what the relations between Fernando and Augusta had really been, and he determined that he could live with her no more. Augusta sorrowfully agreed to his decision, and they parted, as they thought, for ever. Augusta expressed her grief and remorse in 'This summer wind to thee and me' (2 March 1844, no. 169), headed 'A. G. A. to A. S.', and in 'Yes, holy be thy resting-place' (no date, no. 162).

We are told in *Aspin Castle* that Alfred went to England; there he fell ill;

Augusta at once hastened to him, and he died in her arms ('Oh, wander not so far away!' 20 May 1838, no. 61; 'Sacred watcher, wave thy bells', 9 May, 1839, no. 100). Augusta returned to Gondal, overcome with grief ('Sleep brings no joy to me', Nov. 1837, no. 34). Eventually she met someone who reminded her of her lost husband, although he was dark and a stranger ('Where were ye all? And where wert thou?' Oct. 1838, no. 82). Possibly this was Gerald Sidonia, Alfred's brother. But her own end seems to have come before she could embark on another love affair.

She went back to Gaaldine and visited Lake Elnor, where she recollected all the tragedy of Alexander's death ('There shines the moon, at noon of night', 6 March 1837, no. 9). She spent a night and a day there, with only two companions, Lord Lesley and fair Surry, who were betrothed to one another. This was the opportunity of Angelica, who all this time had been waiting for her revenge. She persuaded the outlaw Douglas, who was in love with her, to help her to murder Lesley, Surry and Augusta. Augusta fought hard for her life, and gave Douglas a mortal wound. Angelica spurned him and left him to die. A royal guard arrived too late to save the Queen, under the command of Lord Eldred, who had all his life been her quiet adorer, grieved by her misfortunes and sins, but hoping that a brighter day was dawning for her ('Were they shepherds who sat all day', May 1844, no. 143). He was probably the E. W. who composed two laments on her death; 'How few of all the hearts that loved' (11 March 1844, no. 171) and 'The linnet in the rocky dells' (1 May 1844, no. 173).

The fair daughter of Alfred Sidonia, and probably of Augusta, must be the fair girl who is seen with a dark lover H. A. in the place where the dark Augusta and the fair Alfred once walked, 'In the same place when nature wore' (17 March 1842, no. 153).

When Lord Eldred gazes on Augusta's body—

'Wild morn,' he thought, 'And doubtful noon:
But yet it was a glorious sun,
Though comet-like its course has run.'

This refers back to the early prophecy over the child Augusta, that her life would be like the course of the sun on her birthday.

This reconstruction of Augusta's story has been worked out from the poems without any theory behind it, but when it is examined there appears a pattern, a repetition of two groups, first Angelica, Amadeus, Augusta and Alexander, then the girl Alcona, Fernando, Augusta and Alfred; but although the situation is repeated, the characters are not the same; the gentle nameless girl is a very different person from the savage Angelica. The novelist in Emily was developing, and she was learning how to represent the interplay of situation and character.

The next most important character in Gondal after Augusta was Julius Brenzaida, king of Angora and afterwards emperor. There are twenty poems definitely associated with Augusta, besides a number of others that probably relate to her; there are fourteen poems definitely associated with Julius, and, again, a number of others that probably relate to him. Naturally one wishes to bring these two leading characters into connexion with one another; I once thought that Julius was the father of Augusta, while Miss Ratchford says, more surprisingly, that Augusta is the same person as Rosina, the wife of Julius. According to her theory Julius was Augusta's third and last husband. But both these suggestions are disproved by the Gondal dates of two poems. The earlier date of the two is in the heading to the poem 'Listen! When your hair, like mine' (11 Nov. 1844, no. 178), which runs 'From a Dungeon Wall in the Southern College. J. B. Sept. 1825.'

The second has already been quoted; it is the heading to the poem 'O Day! he cannot die' (2 Dec. 1844, no. 180), 'From a Dungeon Wall in the Northern College. A. G. A. Sept. 1826.' In the first Julius addresses Rosina; he has been imprisoned on account of their love affair. In the second Augusta sorrows over the death of Alexander, which has evidently taken place only a short time before. Thus at the time when the love of Julius and Rosina began, Augusta was the devoted wife of Alexander of Elbë. She certainly cannot be the same person as Rosina Alcona if there is any consistency in her story. The two characteristics of Rosina are her ambition, which makes her urge Julius on to more and more conquests, and her fidelity to Julius, for whom she uttered the great lament, 'Cold in the earth, and the deep snow piled above thee!' (no. 182, 3 March 1845). Augusta, on the other hand, is not ambitious of worldly power; the one war in which she engages was forced on her, and is waged only in self-defence, but in contrast to Rosina she is extremely fickle, passionately in love one day, cruelly casting off the old lover to take a new one the next. If she is supposed to utter the lament for Julius, it must be considered either hypocritical or ironic, and no one who reads it can believe this.

Rosina Alcona was probably related to Fernando's nameless love. The beginning of the story is told in the poem beginning 'Listen! when your hair like mine' (no. 178, 11 Nov. 1844), which, as already mentioned, bears the Gondal date of September 1825. Julius was about to sail for the southern isles with a band of companions, but stayed in Gondal because he fell in love with Rosina. Although he does not seem to have been king at the time, he evidently belonged to the royal family, and was not free to marry wherever he liked. The council arrested him; his judge addressed to him a long exhortation, impressing upon him that 'glorious is the prize of duty', and that on the other hand Love is 'a demon-meteor, wiling Heedless feet to gulfs of crime'. Charlotte printed the first six verses of the poem as *The Elder's Rebuke*, with a concluding verse of her own. Instead of this there are two verses in the latest edition:

'Fain would we your steps reclaim,
Waken fear and holy shame.
And to this end, our council well
And kindly doomed you to a cell
Whose darkness may, perchance, disclose
A beacon-guide from sterner woes.'

So spake my Judge—then seized his lamp
And left me in the dungeon damp,
A vault-like place whose stagnant air
Suggests and nourishes despair!

Thus left alone Julius apostrophises Rosina, naturally but unfairly reproaching her for having got him into trouble, and saying that she does not love him nearly as much as he loves her, and that he suspects she accepted him from ambition rather than from love. Julius has a disagreeable way of thinking that the women he loves are not worthy of him, but in this case his irritation is pardonable. He does not, however, express the rage and despair that most of Emily's prisoners feel; he is very much annoyed, but he does not seem to expect his imprisonment to last long.

This must have been the time when Amadeus and Angelica were plotting the rebellion against Augusta in Gaaldine. Perhaps the young men who sailed from Gondal were sent by Angora to help the rebels. On this reckoning the great battle in which Alexander of Elbë was killed and Augusta taken prisoner happened in the summer of 1826. We next find Julius in Gaaldine in winter-time, probably

the winter of 1826, when Augusta was in prison. Julius may have been released and sent out to Gaaldine with reinforcements for the rebels.

Julius fell in love with a maiden of Gaaldine called Geraldine S. Miss Ratchford says that she is the same person as Augusta, but while it is true that Geraldine played the same part in the love affair of Rosina and Julius as Augusta did in that of Fernando and the nameless girl, Geraldine cannot be the same person as the imprisoned Augusta. Julius and Geraldine met on a moor beneath an ancient thorn tree in the snow, but when spring came he bade her adieu, probably when he set out on the summer campaign. Meanwhile in Gondal Exina had won the victory over Angora and Augusta was set free; presumably peace was made between the two countries, but fighting went on in Gaaldine, perhaps not between Exina and Angora, but between Angora and the independent kingdoms of Gaaldine. In the autumn Julius returned to the neighbourhood where Geraldine lived, and in a song invited her to meet him again beside the old thorn—'Geraldine, the moon is shining' (17 Oct. 1838, no. 80), 'Song by Julius Brenzaida to G. S.' She however repulsed him; she told him that they had said Adieu for ever, that hard commands were laid upon her to see him no more, and that she had been threatened with imprisonment for disobedience. Julius was extremely offended by this insult as he considered it. He told her that if threats could make her give him up, she was false and cold, and he would return to someone who appreciated him properly, evidently Rosinà ('I knew not 'twas so dire a crime', 'J. Brenzaida to G. S.', 17 Oct. 1838, no. 81). Unfortunately, just as Julius had convinced himself that he loved no one but Rosina, Geraldine, stung by his reproaches, defied her hostile family (presumably the people who laid their hard commands upon her), and flung herself upon his protection. At least this seems to explain the situation in which we next find her, when she is in hiding and the mother of Brenzaida's child. The scene of the poem called *Geraldine* (''Twas night: her comrades gathered all', 17 Aug. 1841, no. 150) is Zedora, which we know from the list in Anne's geography book to have been part of Gaaldine ruled by a viceroy. Perhaps it was a dependency of Angora, and the base from which the Angoran army invaded the other kingdoms of Gaaldine. Evening is falling, and Geraldine lies in a cave surrounded by palm-trees and cedars, singing her baby to sleep, attended by only one faithful friend, perhaps a nurse, the speaker in the poem, who calls Geraldine 'my lady'. Far away they see the lights of a walled city where Geraldine's comrades are holding a festival, but Geraldine is happy singing to her child, and tracing its likeness to Brenzaida. Her attendant, however, is sad and full of anxiety for the mother and child. The baby's sex is never mentioned, but from the poem called in the Gondal MS. 'Farewell to Alexandria' ('I've seen this dell in July's shine', 12 July 1839, no. 108), it seems that the child was a girl, called Alexandria. Alexandria (the omission of the 'r' may be accidental) was one of the kingdoms of Gaaldine, according to Anne's list; Julius's daughter was very likely named in remembrance of one of her father's conquests. For all the time that the intrigue with Geraldine was going on, the chief occupation and interest of Julius was the conquest of the kingdoms of Gaaldine. The city of Tyndarum was taken by storm ('A sudden chasm of ghastly light', 14 Oct. 1837, no. 29). The city of Zalona was starved into submission after a long and terrible siege ('All blue and bright in glorious light', Gondal MS., 24 Feb. 1843, no. 156). Zalona is another of the kingdoms on Anne's list.

At this point in the story, about the Gondal year 1828, Julius seems to have returned to Gondal and become king of Angora. Whether he succeeded to the crown constitutionally, or whether he led his victorious army home and seized the

crown for himself, does not appear. He would now naturally want to marry Rosina Alcona, both because he really loved her, and also to score off the council who had formerly interfered with his love affair and imprisoned him, but Geraldine with the child followed him to Angora, creating a very awkward situation. The poem which was printed under the name of *The Outcast Mother*, but which Emily called 'A Farewell to Alexandria' (no. 108), is probably spoken by Geraldine, although her name is not mentioned. She and the child have lived on the moors since the summer, and in the fine weather they were happy enough:

And, oh! I've seen such music swell,—
Such wild notes wake these passes lone,—
So soft, yet so intensely felt;—
So low, yet so distinctly heard;
My breath would pause, my eyes would melt,
And my tears dew the green heath-sward.

But now it is winter, and Geraldine is in utter despair. It is snowing; the drifts are overwhelming, and in the end she abandons the child, whom she believes to be dying. On the same day as she wrote this poem (12 July 1839), Emily wrote a fragment of forty-six lines in octosyllabic couplets modelled very closely on Scott, describing the arrival at a shepherd's cottage of a beautiful but sinister stranger, a man with basilisk eyes (no. 107). He is more like Charlotte's Zamorna than any of Emily's characters, but this is due to the fact that he is so Byronic. I think that he is Julius, who had either broken finally with Geraldine—hence her despair and abandonment of the child—or else he had been moved by remorse to bring help to his victims, but had been unable to find them, and believed they had perished in the snow.

There seems however every reason to suppose that they both were saved, though not together. Another character comes into the story, Blanche, who had once been a court lady, but now lived like a gipsy on the moors; perhaps she had been ruined in the war of 1826-7. At any rate her troubles were 'not through age and not through crime' ('None of my kindred now can tell', June 1838, no. 64). A fragment beginning 'Redbreast, early in the morning' (Feb. 1837, no. 7) has no Gondal names or heading, but it fits in appropriately here, as it describes how someone bowed down by constant sorrow found a little child lying deserted on the moor in winter-time, and at the same time heard a strain of wild music. This seems to be Blanche discovering the baby Alexandria. The theme of music runs through all this story of Geraldine and her child. Julius sings to Geraldine, Geraldine sings to her baby; Geraldine hears strange music on the moor, Blanche hears wild music when she finds the child. There follows a song 'To A. A. by Blanche' beginning 'This shall be thy lullaby' (May 1838, no. 62). She has taken the child across lake Elderno and they are now crossing the sea, but though there is a storm the baby sleeps peacefully. A. A. may stand for Alexandria Angora, but Blanche of course could not know that that was the foundling's name. Blanche seems to have taken the little girl to Ula's Isle, an island off the coast of Gaaldine; Ula and Zedora are sometimes mentioned together, so Alexandria had almost gone back to her birth-place. She was brought up in Ula's Hall, which seems to have been a sort of board-school for young ladies, where, it goes without saying, she was unhappy.

On 19 July 1839, the week after she wrote 'A Farewell to Alexandria' and the description of the stranger in the shepherd's cottage ('And now the house-dog stretched once more', 12 July 1839, no. 107), Emily began to describe the recognition scene between Geraldine and Alexandria, when they at last met, or at

least so I interpret the verses beginning 'Come hither, child; who gifted thee' (no. 109), against which, in the margin, there is written a quotation from *The Lay of the Last Minstrel*. A lady asks a child how she came to play music which rouses painful thoughts in the lady's breast. The child replies that she learnt this music in Ula's Hall, when she was only six years old; she was sad and lonely, and on a festal night she sat alone and unfriended in her room when she heard a voice of seraph sweetness singing, 'Three times it rose, that seraph-strain', and she had never forgotten it. Here the mysterious music comes into the story again. The fragment 'It is not pride, it is not shame' (no. 115) seems to be part of a longer poem, never written, giving the conclusion of Geraldine's story with her recovery of her daughter.

This is leaving King Julius behind in speculations about his child. Returning to Angora in or about 1828, we may conjecture that Julius married Rosina, after either casting off Geraldine, or becoming convinced that she and her child were dead. He then undertook another campaign in Gaaldine, in which he conquered the kingdom of Almedore. He wrote a song of triumph for his victory, *Song by Julius Angora*, 'Awake, awake! how loud the stormy morning' (Dec. 1837, no. 40). As he was now Julius Angora instead of Julius Brenzaida, I assume that he had become king of Angora. There is no doubt that he is the same person as Julius Brenzaida. After this victory he took the additional title of Almedore. He was now master of the whole of Gaaldine, except Ula, an island, and the kingdom of Elseradon, which may have belonged to Exina. Roderic Lesley, who died of wounds on the field of victory in 1830 (Gondal date), may have been Julius's general in this campaign ('Lie down and rest, the fight is done', 18 Dec. 1843, no. 164).

After the murder of Queen Augusta, her successor on the throne of Exina seems to have been King Gerald. As we know nothing about the way in which the Gondal crowns descended, this may have been Gerald Sidonia, the brother of Alfred, Augusta's husband. Again, Gerald may have been Augusta's son; if so he must have been very young, as Augusta herself died comparatively young, but if Gerald was the child of her first marriage, with Alexander of Elbë, he might be fifteen or sixteen, which was probably old enough to rule in Gondal, where almost everyone was very young.

King Gerald, whatever his descent, was a kinsman of King Julius, and the two met at a great ceremony in a cathedral, where they swore never-dying union; but King Julius was already plotting treachery. This scene was revealed by magic or clairvoyance to someone far away on a moor, who set off on horseback to warn Gerald, but he was stopped at a dangerous ford by a strange woman. Was it Angelica, still bent on revenge? There are three fragments of a poem telling this story, 'It's over now; I've known it all' (no. 55), 'The wide cathedral Isles are lone' (no. 56), and 'Oh, hinder me by no delay!' (no. 57) (March 1838). Julius suddenly attacked Exina and took King Gerald prisoner; perhaps Gerald was wounded in the fight, at any rate he died in prison. The poem 'His land may burst the galling chain' (undated, no. 125) describes his imprisonment and death. His general, Gleneden, was also taken prisoner. Arthur Gleneden fought and fell in the war of 1826-7; this is another of the family. He was taken prisoner in the spring, and probably sent to Gaaldine, as were most important prisoners of state. Exina however put up a desperate resistance for the rest of the year, and early in the following spring King Julius set out to complete his conquest, leaving his wife Rosina very ill and unconscious in a fever. He won a complete victory in the south

country, but on his return to his palace he was assassinated at the celebration of his triumph. His murderer, evidently an Exina patriot, was immediately cut down. All this was revealed in a fevered dream to Gleneden in his distant cell ('Tell me, watcher, is it winter?' 21 May 1838, no. 63). There is another description of the assassination in 'King Julius left the south country' (30 April 1839, no. 98). Queen Rosina recovered from her illness, and begged for news of the war. She was convinced of her husband's victory. Her attendants gradually broke to her the story of his success and his death ('Weeks of wild delirium past', 1 Sept. 1841, no. 151).

There is a poem 'O God of Heaven! the dream of horror' (7 Aug. 1837, no. 15) which has no Gondal heading or names, but the subject is the return to freedom of a prisoner, who in prison was troubled by fearful dreams, but who is now sailing over the sea with a brother or a sister to 'thy father's home and mine'. One hopes that this was Gleneden, and that he was at last released and restored to his friends. After the death of King Julius it seems that Exina recovered its independence and those who had been driven into exile returned. There was another great ceremony in the cathedral ('The organ swells, the trumpets sound', 30 Sept. 1837, no. 28), in which the speaker reproaches the celebrants because none of them seem to remember who sleeps below, in a dark cell under their feet, evidently a tomb, not a prison. This may be a reference to the unfortunate King Gerald.

The only further record of Queen Rosina is her great lament, 'Cold in the earth, and the deep snow piled above thee' (March 1845, no. 152); of which the Gondal date was fifteen years after the death of King Julius (or the Emperor Julius, he seems to have taken the title of Emperor on conquering Exina). Henry Angora is mentioned in Emily's diary letter of 1845. The poem 'In the same place, where nature wore' (17 May 1842, no. 153) is headed 'H. A. and A. S.' H. A. might be Henry Angora and A. S. the daughter of Augusta and Alfred Sidonia. Their marriage would unite the kingdoms of Angora and Exina and end the nationalist wars. But this was not the end of strife in Gondal, for then the class war broke out between royalists and republicans. Some of Emily's latest and finest poems are about this last period of Gondal history, but in it there was no one dominating character, like Augusta or Julius.

M. HOPE DODDS

GATESHEAD

SOME AMBIVALENT WORDS AND AN ETYMOLOGY

I

Language is anything but logical, whether in the use of grammatical forms, in syntax, or in the meaning it attaches to words. All its rules are *post factum*, and even when they can be formulated there are few that show no exceptions. It develops as a product of mind and life and displays in no small measure the waywardness and impulsiveness of the one as well as the variety and complexity of the other. At times its terms are clear-cut and precise, at others elliptical and allusive, according as the need for clarity or the trend towards economy of effort prevails in its development. It has also its playful, freakish and exuberant moments.

The purpose of this essay is to examine some cases of ambiguous meaning attached to words, with a view to rendering acceptable an etymology which, I believe, has not yet been put forward.

The particular ambiguity with which we are concerned is that of words which can be applied at will to either of two or more parties (animate or inanimate) involved in a single process, act, or relationship. Thus: 'I sit in an arm-chair; *the chair is comfortable and I am comfortable in it.*' 'I receive news which makes me sad—I receive *sad news.*' '*The player plays well because the pitch is playing well.*' Similarly: 'I find these apples easy to cook; they *cook easily*; they are *good cooks*, but not *good eaters.*'¹ '*The barber shaves quickly because the razor shaves smoothly and the customer shaves easily.*' It is only after a little reflexion that one realizes how illogical, or alogical, and how convenient are these commonplaces of everyday speech, and how cumbersome our language would be without them.²

The words relating to the five senses are particularly prone to this ambiguous use. '*I feel the cold wind; the wind feels cold;*' '*I look him over, and he looks trustworthy.*' '*I smell the rose, and the rose smells sweet.*' '*I taste the food, and the food tastes wholesome.*' It is for no a priori reason, but a mere accident of language development, that *touch*, *hear*, and *see* (cp. Germ. *aussehen*) have not the same ambivalence. In French, the verb for 'to smell' alone possesses this double value: '*je sens la rose, et la rose sent bon*'. But here French goes even further than English and uses or used ambivalently the verbs *embaumer* (lit. 'to make balmy') and *flairer* ('to scent', e.g. *flairer le danger*); cp. *le jardin embaumait la fleur d'oranger* ('was filled with the scent of orange blossom'); *le mets flairait* (now *fleurait*) *le clou de girofle* ('the dish had a scent of cloves'). Similarly, and a fortiori, words connoting a reciprocal obligation between individuals, like *debt*, *to hire*, Fr. *louer*, can be said of both parties, and, in the dual relationship between teacher and pupil, both standard French and popular English use the pupil's word (cp. *cela vous apprendra*, 'that'll learn you', *il m'apprend le grec*, etc.) for both aspects of what, after all, is a single though joint operation.

The psychological process underlying these common facts would appear to be that the word suffices to call up the situation, operation, or transaction concerned, and the context, circumstantial and verbal, showing how the word is applied, prevents any misunderstanding. In fact, the ambiguity of these words is purely theoretical, a dictionary ambiguity.

¹ Cp. French: *une rue passante, 10 places assises, un quartier commerçant, etc.*

² Cp. Greenough and Kittredge, *Words and their Ways in English Speech*, pp. 272-83.

Except possibly for *embaumer* and *flairer*, the cases mentioned so far will not have struck the reader as in any way strange. Somewhat stranger perhaps is popular English *You don't suit that hat* for *That hat doesn't suit you*. Just as in the twofold operation of teaching and learning, the more important consideration is that the pupil should learn, and not that the teacher should teach—hence, no doubt, the tendency for the pupil's word to oust its partner—so here the predominant consideration is how the wearer *looks* in the hat and not how the hat *looks* on the wearer. Then, it may be asked, why not simply *You don't look well in that hat*? The reluctance to use this formula may be due to two reasons: *You don't look well*, (i) is itself ambiguous and (ii) might be felt to be a trifle impolite. So, popular speech, availing itself of the inherent psychological ambivalence of *to suit*—e.g. both a maid and a mistress 'get suited'—uses the verb of the wearer instead of the thing worn. It may be, too, that the expression *That hat doesn't suit me* tends to mean 'is not to my liking'.

More striking still is the popular French expression *enfoncer son chapeau dans sa tête*,¹ 'to pull one's hat right down', 'to get one's head right inside one's hat'. It can be accounted for, we would suggest, as follows: *enfoncer*, 'to stick in' or 'to stave in', derived as it is from *fond*, connotes usually a downward, and, less usually perhaps, a horizontal motion: e.g. *enfoncer une épingle*, *enfoncer une porte*. *Enfoncer sa tête dans quelque chose* would certainly suggest a downward or horizontal movement of the head (e.g. *dans l'eau*, *dans les feuilles*, etc.); hence, doubtless (and also because the head remains more or less stationary), the reluctance to use the logical *enfoncer sa tête dans son chapeau*. The idea of 'downward movement' (which is, in fact, performed with the hat) and of 'insertion' are both expressed in *enfoncer son chapeau dans sa tête*, but the terms *chapeau* and *tête* are quite illogically, not to say comically, reversed.

The last case we shall cite at length is that of Old French *devoir*, which provides examples of a very sharp reversal of meaning. When Guiot de Provins in his *Bible* or 'world-survey', written about the beginning of the thirteenth century, declaims against the corruption of the papal court at Rome, he says 'It is no wonder if the Romans are false and malicious', and proceeds:

La terre le doit et li lieus,

the 'land and place' having been the scene of many a crime and martyrdom. 'It is due or owing to the land' has become 'The land owes it'. The relationship of 'owing' is expressed, but the impersonal *it*, as subject, has yielded to the psychologically predominant *the land*. Elsewhere, speaking of a certain monastic order, he says 'They give to the sick members their rightful pittance as the rule ordains':

Ainsi que la regle le doit,

i.e. 'as the rule owes it', instead of 'as is their duty to the rule'.²

The ambivalence of words of 'feeling', and the alternation of impersonal and personal constructions which are both presupposed in the etymology I have to suggest, can be further illustrated by French *agréer*, which means 'to find acceptable' (e.g. *agréez mes hommages*) but once meant 'to be acceptable' (e.g. *sa venue m'agréé*, 'his coming is very gratifying to me'), by Engl. *to savour of*, as against Fr. *savourer*, 'to relish', by the two meanings of Engl. *relish* (noun) and Fr. *goût* (of

¹ See *Petit Larousse*, s.v. *Hypallage*.

² A B.B.C. announcer, describing the tennis at Wimbledon, said that the play was a little listless, and continued: 'it may have something

to do with the weather', which was close and thundery—a disconcerting suggestion, if taken literally.

persons and things), by Engl. *I am agreeable* ('I consent'), *I like it* (orig. *it likes me*), *it grieves me* and *I grieve* (Old Fr. from which *to grieve* was borrowed does not use the latter construction), and by Engl. *I shall do as I please*, compared with Fr. *comme il me plaira*.

II

The etymology in question is that of Fr. *savoir gré*, 'to be grateful'. The expression is so familiar and composed of such familiar elements that the peculiarity of this use of *savoir* is not at once apparent. *Gré* itself has interesting semantic features. Coming from Latin GRATUM, it should mean 'a pleasing thing', and Littré's first meaning for it is 'ce qui plaît'. But his examples, almost without exception, convey the idea of 'pleasure felt' or 'good will' rather than 'pleasure given' (e.g. *se marier contre le gré de ses parents*), and thus illustrate the same switch-over of meaning as we have seen in other words.

That a word connoting 'pleasure felt' should take on the specialized meaning of 'gratitude' offers no difficulty. *Gratitude* itself is related to GRATUS; 'a grateful prospect' is 'a *pleasing* prospect'; and 'I should be *glad* of your help' is but another way of saying 'I should be *grateful* for your help'. The point which really needs explanation is the use of *savoir* in connexion with *gré* to mean 'to feel gratitude', i.e. as an equivalent of *ressentir* or *éprouver*, or *porter* in '*porter de la reconnaissance à quelqu'un*'.

Let us go back to the origin of *savoir*. It comes from Vulgar Latin SAPĒRE, Classical SAPĒRE. SAPĒRE meant first of all 'to taste', of things, then 'to taste', of persons, then 'to have taste', 'to show discrimination' and, finally, 'to know'. It was with the latter meaning that it was used in popular speech as a highly successful rival to the classical SCIRE, a less full-bodied word, which, when amplified to ISKIRE or ESKIRE, as it would tend to be in pronunciation, had the further disadvantage of being in close homophonic contact with EXIRE.¹ But, backed up as it was by its etymological associates: SAPIDUM (Fr. *sade*), MALE SAPIDUM (Fr. *maussade*), to say nothing of SAPOREM and its offshoots SAPOROSUM and SAPORARE (Fr. *saveur*, *savoureux* and *savourer*), it did not lose entirely its earlier meaning, which, though enfeebled, persists, or persisted, alongside its lusty rival, in a number of Romance languages, e.g. Italian, Spanish and Portuguese. In French, the following extract from Eustache Deschamps (cit. Godefroy, s.v. *Saveir*):

Leur potage *savoit* les pos
Et leur sausse n'estoit que vin,

shows us the meaning of 'to savour of' surviving till the fourteenth century, and an earlier text shows us the verb *savoir* used with the 'active' meaning of 'to smell', a development which clearly goes back to one of the primary values of Latin SAPĒRE:

Que por l'ulleis qu'il *savoient*
Disoient que c'erent espisses;

i.e. 'For because of the roasting they smelt, they said it was spices' (Raoul de Houdan, *Songe d'enfer*, cit. Godef. *ibid.*). Admittedly, this and similar uses of *savoir* are in decline in medieval French. In the passage from Raoul de Houdan, for instance, there is a variant reading *sentoient* (v. Godef. s.v. *Usleis*); and in a passage from *Eneas* (ll. 3479-80):

Mais bien li poist ou *mal li sace*,
Droit li estuet que il me face,

¹ Cp. *ax* for *ask* in popular English, and *Félisque* for *Félix* in French.

where we have an interesting impersonal use of the verb ('be it right cumbersome or distasteful to him, he must do me justice'), the words *mal li sace* are replaced in two MSS. by *li desplace*. None the less, we are justified in assuming that at an earlier period this strain of meaning was much more vigorous and that representatives of *MALUM SAPIT* or *BONUM SAPIT*, for example (cp. the following extract from *Yvain*, ll. 2856-7:

Tot manja le pain a l'ermite
Mes sire Yvains, que *bon li sot*),

would be of constant occurrence. If that is so, what could be more natural than to suppose that, before the disappearance of the adjective *GRATUS*, the expression *GRATUM SAPIT*, meaning 'it is pleasant to the taste' or 'it is gratifying' (cp. *mal li sace*, above) also existed, and that in the pre-literary period of French, *savoir gré* (or its phonological predecessor) was used of the object which caused gratification (cp. O.F. *agr  r*) before being used of the person gratified? The change-over to the modern meaning would of course be facilitated, not to say rendered inevitable, by the disappearance of the adjective and by the decay of the primary connotations of the verb, acting in conjunction with the natural trend towards ambivalence of this kind of expression, a trend which we have amply illustrated above. A passage from *La Vie de St. Thomas* (cit. Littr  , s.v. *Gr  *) enables us to visualize how, in certain types of sentence, the transference of meaning could very readily come about:

L'apostoles [le pape] l'asiet [Thomas] juste lui erramment,
E bien seit il venuz,   o li ad dit suvent;
E mult li seit [sait] *bon gr   que si grant fais enprent*,
Qu'encontre rei de terre sainte iglise defent.

Here, if our etymology is correct, *li*, at an earlier date, would have referred to 'the pope' and *sait bon gr  * would have been impersonal: 'It is right gratifying to him that [Thomas] undertakes such a heavy task.' But, as the earlier meaning of *savoir* became submerged, the verb would become personal and 'active' and *li* would be apprehended as referring to the subject of *enprent*, the source of the gratification.

To sum up, *savoir gr  * 'to be grateful', which is a semasiological oddity if *savoir* is *SAPERE* 'to know' and *gr  * the noun *GRATUM*, ceases to be peculiar if *savoir* is *SAPERE* 'to taste' and *gr  *, originally, an adjective. On this basis, the verb joins the ranks of verbs of 'feeling', prone, all of them, to become ambivalent; and the change from **me sait gr  *, 'it is gratifying to me', to *je sais gr  *, 'I am grateful', is on all fours with that of *cela m'agr  e* to *j'agr  e cela*, of *it likes me* to *I like it*, or of *it grieves me* to *I grieve at it*. (For the reversal from personal to impersonal cp. popular Fr. *  a me connaît* for *je m'y connais*, and *c'est moi* for O.F. *ce suis-je*.) The German *Dank wissen* is clearly but a blind teutonizing of an idiom which could only have arisen in a Romance tongue, and, in essence, a double blunder.

JOHN ORR

EDINBURGH

THE IMPERFECT RHYMES E:I, O:U IN EARLY ITALIAN POETRY

That the early Italian lyric poets employed the imperfect rhymes *e:i*, *o:u*, was denied by Parodi in one of his valuable philological studies.¹ The proofs furnished by him in support of his view may, however, be increased, thanks to additional evidence. The documents furnishing such evidence are already known to scholars. But as they have never so far been considered in relation to the problem of imperfect rhymes in the early Italian lyric they are well worth examining from such a standpoint. First of all one should consider the opinions of early grammarians on the subject. In some ways they anticipated the views of nineteenth-century scholars on this subject, and as such they have some historical importance. But besides this their investigations on the subject of imperfect rhymes are of interest to us since they show how such a subject soon commanded the attention of scholars.

Unfortunately enough for us Dante never dealt with it in his *De Vulgari Eloquentia*. Had he done so he would have spared much trouble to philologists. It was instead Pietro Bembo that started the long line of investigators in this field. In his *Prose della volgar lingua*, first published in 1525, but composed at an earlier date, Bembo wrote:

È oltre acciò da sapere, che gli antichi poeti posero la detta particella *ROI*, et la seconda voce del verbo *POSSO*, in una medesima rima con tutte queste voci *CUI*, *LUI*, *COSTUI*, *COLUI*, *ALTERUI*, *FUI*: sì come si legge nelle canzoni di Guido Cavalcanti, et di Dino Frescobaldi, et di Dante; lasciando da parte le terze rime sue, che sono vie più, che non si convien, piene di libertà et d'ardire. Quantunque Brunetto Latini; che fu a Dante maestro, più licentiosamente anchora, che quelli non fecero, o pure più rozza-mente Luna et Persona; Cagione et comune, Motto et Tutto; Vso et Gratoso, sapere et venire, et dell' altre di questa maniera ponesse etiamdico per rime nel suo Tesoro: il quale nel vero tale non fu, che il suo discepolo furandoglielo se ne fosse potuto aricchire.²

Bembo approached the problem without reaching any possible solution of it. It was left instead to the members of the commission entrusted with the bowdlerizing of the text of the *Decameron* to suggest an explanation for it. In their report published in 1574, these scholars wondered whether the rhymes *e:i*, *o:u*, might possibly be due to a great closeness between *e* and *i*, and *o* and *u* in early pronunciation.³ Such an explanation was, however, put forward only tentatively as a possibility. It was none the less accepted as the actual truth by Celso Cittadini, who in his *Origini della toscana favella*, which appeared in 1604, emphasized the great closeness between *o* and *u*, at the same time explaining the rhyme *o:u* on these grounds.⁴ The views of the sixteenth-century scholars on imperfect rhymes held the field for a long time. Even so eminent a scholar as the late Ernesto Monaci conformed with the views of his Renaissance predecessors,⁵ and it was only Parodi

¹ E. G. Parodi, 'Rima siciliana, rima aretina e bolognese', *Bullettino della Società Dantesca Italiana*, n.s. xx (1913), pp. 113-42.

² *Le Prose di M. Pietro Bembo* (Venezia, 1552), pp. 231-2.

³ *Annotationi et Discorsi sopra alcuni luoghi del Decameron di M. Giovanni Boccacci fatte dalli molto Magnifici Sig. Deputati da loro Altezze Serenissime* (Firenze, 1574), sigg. G4r-v.

⁴ *Le origini della toscana favella del Signor Celso Cittadini* (Siena, 1628), pp. 11-13. Present

circumstances have prevented me from seeing Claudio Tolomei's 'La rima che cosa sia e quante lettere bisogna rimare' and 'Delle rime proprie e delle improprie', both of which are still unpublished and preserved in MS. Biblioteca Comunale, Siena, H. vii, 15. References to the question of imperfect rhymes probably occur in these two treatises.

⁵ G. Bertoni, 'Intorno alle questioni sulla lingua nella lirica italiana delle origini', *Studi Medievali*, I (1904-5), pp. 587-8.

that was able to produce a final explanation to this very knotty problem in the aforementioned study.¹

To return for a moment to the Renaissance grammarians, it might seem perhaps strange that with all their critical insight, and this was often very remarkable, they should never have connected the formation of imperfect rhymes with scribal interference. Particularly strange, since the fact that scribes were apt to give a dialectal complexion to their transcripts of vernacular texts had been fully realized during the *Cinquecento*.²

It is generally accepted now that the early Italian lyric poets employed perfect rhymes, these often becoming imperfect when they were not possible in the scribe's dialect. A typical example of the destruction of rhymes at the hand of scribes can still be seen. Some years ago Bertoni brought to light and published a Florentine version of part of the *Libro* of Uguçon da Laodho.³ This text is far from being a conscious translation of the Lombard original into Florentine. Rather than that, it might be described as a transcript of the poem by a scribe from Florence. The inevitable result of this was that in this copy Uguçon's poem acquired a distinctly Florentine flavour. Now this Florentine 'edition' of the *Libro* shows exactly how imperfect rhymes were started. As a comparison of the Lombard original with the Florentine transcript shows, only too often rhymes perfect in the original became imperfect in the Florentine rendering. The following are a few examples:

Lombard Text

Claudà li fo le man e li pei
da quili pessimi *gudei* (907-8).
Lo corpo vol *cuçar e cir*
e ben calçar e ben *vestir* (1091-2).
Quelor terrà per lo *camin*
del dives qe fe la rea *fin* (1241-2).

Florentine Text

Chiavati li furo li mani et *piedi*
dalli crudelissimi *Giudei* (116-17).
Lo corpo vole *giocar e ridere*
e ben calçare e ben *vestire* (233-4).
Coloro terranno per lo *camino*
del dive e farà *fine* (283-4).

As these examples show, Lombard rhymes often failed to turn into Florentine rhymes; and whenever this occurred, it led to the creation of a false rhyme in the Tuscan text.

A similar vanishing of the rhyme may be seen in some transcripts of Tuscan poems in the *Memoriali Bolognesi*.⁴ Just to give one instance, the text of one of Cino da Pistoia's poems in a Bolognese *Memoriale* shows the false rhyme *ociso : vizo*,⁵ while the Tuscan text of the poem shows instead the correct rhyme *ucciso : viso*.

It seems unlikely that dialectal influence should have been totally responsible for the introduction of false rhymes. Besides this, the way in which lyrical poetry was transcribed during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries must also have contributed to it. Since the sixteenth century each line in a poem occupies a line of print. As a result of this all the rhyme words stand at the end of a line, and in

¹ Supra, p. 134, n. 1.

² *Annotationi et Discorsi*, sig. Dd1r.

³ G. Bertoni, 'Un rimaneggiamento toscano del *Libro* di Uguçon da Laodho', *Studi Medievali*, I (1904-5), pp. 235-62. It was also re-published by Bertoni in *Rendiconti della R. Accademia dei Lincei*, ser. v, xxi (1913), pp. 607-84. The original Lombard text is in *Das Buch des Uguçon da Laodho*, ed. A. Tobler (Berlin, 1884).

⁴ On which cf. G. Carducci, *Intorno ad alcune rime dei secoli xiii e xiv ritrovate nei Memoriali dell' Archivio Notarile di Bologna* (Imola, 1876); F. Pellegrini, 'Rime inedite dei secoli xiii e xiv

tratte dai libri dell' Archivio notarile di Bologna', *Il Propugnatore*, n.s. III (1890), pp. 113 ff.; E. Levi, 'Cantilene e ballate dei secoli xiii e xiv dai "Memoriali" di Bologna', *Studi Medievali*, IV (1912-13), pp. 279-334.

⁵ Levi, op. cit. p. 301. For the influence of the scribes' dialect on the copying of vernacular lyrics cf. also MS. Vatican Library, Barb. lat. 3953, partly copied by and partly for Niccolò de Rossi of Treviso between 1325 and 1335, and published in *Il canzoniere Vat. barb. lat. 3953*, ed. G. Lega (Bologna, 1905).

poems with lines of uniform length, also more or less one above the other, so that they easily catch the eye. But this was not the case in early manuscripts. In these the transcription of lyric poetry differed little from that of prose. If we take for instance the following stanza from Dante's *Vita Nuova*, vii:

O voi che per la via d'Amor passate
attendete e guardate
s'egli è dolore alcun, quanto il mio grave;
e prego sol ch'audir mi sofferiate,
e poi immaginate
s'io son d'ogni tormento ostale e chiave.
Amor, non già per mia poca bontate,
ma per sua nobiltate
mi pose in vita sì dolce e soave

and we glance at the transcript of it in MS. Vat. Chigiano L. v. 176, fo. 15 r, we shall find it copied thus:

O voi che plavia damor passate ✓ attendete τ guardate ✓ (glie do lore alcun quantol mio graue: Et priego solchadir misoffriate: τ poi ymagnate: sio son dogni dolore ostello ∫ chiaue: Amor non gia pmia poca bontate: ma psua nobiltate: mi pose i vita si dolce ∫ soaue...

With verse copied in this way, false rhymes would not catch the eye as easily as in poetry transcribed in the modern fashion. They would not, since the reader's eye would not be able to detect at once a rhyme word from another one. Now in as far as rhymes are concerned, the visual element is of considerable importance. Such an importance is brought home to us particularly in English poetry, where purely visual rhymes often occur.¹ Hence it seems only likely that the way in which vernacular lyrics were transcribed during the Middle Ages helped considerably the creation of imperfect rhymes, since scribes would not have their eyes particularly caught by the rhyme words.²

Amongst the evidence supporting the view that the early Italian lyric poets never employed the imperfect rhymes *e : i*, *o : u*, great authority must be assigned to the Vatican manuscript of the *Documenti d'Amore* by Francesco da Barberino.³ This manuscript is, as far as we are concerned, invaluable. It is so, since it is the only early Tuscan poetic text which has come down to us in the author's autograph.⁴ Moreover Francesco da Barberino⁵ was a contemporary of Dante, and he was in contact with some of the poets of the so-called *stil nuovo*.⁶ Hence his autograph, which was probably finished about 1315,⁷ places before us both the language and spelling habits of an early Tuscan poet uncontaminated by scribal interference. Now many of the words which caused the imperfect rhymes *e : i*

¹ Cf. H. C. Wyld, *Studies in English Rhymes from Surrey to Pope* (London, 1923), pp. 56-7.

² It is interesting to note that the way in which Terence's Comedies were transcribed caused them to be considered as prose in the later Middle Ages, cf. P. S. Allen, *The Age of Erasmus* (Oxford, 1914), p. 35, n. 1.

³ MS. Vat. Barb. 4076. For a description of this MS. cf. *I Documenti d'Amore di Francesco da Barberino secondo i manoscritti originali a cura di Francesco Egidi* (Roma, 1905-27), iv, pp. xvi-xxiii.

⁴ Of course we still possess the autograph of Petrarch's *Canzoniere*, published in *Il Canzoniere*

di Francesco Petrarca riprodotto letteralmente dal Cod. Vaticano Latino 3195, ed. E. Modigliani (Roma, 1904), but this belongs, needless to say, to a later age.

⁵ On whom cf. especially A. Thomas, *Francesco da Barberino et la Littérature Provençale en Italie au Moyen Age* (Paris, 1883).

⁶ Thomas, op. cit. pp. 14, 17.

⁷ The Italian text of *I Documenti d'Amore* was started in Italy and completed in Provence in 1308-13 (G. Vandelli, 'Per la datazione della Commedia', *Studi Danteschi*, xiii (1923), p. 7). The extant MS. Vat. Barb. 4076 (A) must have been finished before 25 April 1315 (ibid. pp. 8-9).

and *o* : *u* in other texts occur here; but, and this is most important, in no case do they give rise to an imperfect rhyme in Barberino's manuscript.

The following is a list of such rhymes in the *Documenti d' Amore*. In the quotations, the numerals refer to volume and page in Egidi's edition.

(1) E : E. *dextra* : *senestra* (i. 27), *proffere* : *chere* (i. 73), *pentere* : *dovere* (i. 204), *impiere* : *cherere* (i. 257-8), *dextro* : *senestro* (i. 330), *dece* : *desdece* (i. 340), *cadere* : *pentere* (ii. 193), *pitette* : *mette* (iii. 114), *pentere* : *chere* (iii. 290).—*Senestra*, *senestro*, are either Aretine or Sienese forms, as shown by *i* > *e*. *Proffere* and *pentere* show a passage from the 4th to the 2nd conjugation, and are common forms in early Tuscan texts, cf. for instance *pentere* in *Inferno*, xxvii, 119. *Impiere* is the normal development of *implere*; *pitette* is a Gallicism, for which cf. *pitetto*, *Tristano Riccardiano*,¹ p. 172. There remains *desdece*, in which *i* > *e* probably by analogy with *detto*, *disdetto*.

(2) I : I. *ditto* : *scripto* (i. 285-6), *scripto* : *e ditto* (i. 296), *carpire* : *sentire* : *tegnire* (ii. 271), *ditto* : *scripto* (iii. 85), *aderitto* : *ditto* (iii). All Latinisms except *tegnire* which is a Sicilian form showing the Sicilian development *e* > *i*.

(3) O : O. *ciascono* : *pono* (i. 18), *troppo* : *groppo* (i. 47-8), *troppa* : *agroppa* (i. 62), *nascoso* : *chioso* (i. 226, ii. 201-2), *longo* : *pongo* (i. 228, 280-1, etc.), *congionte* : *prompte* (i. 257), *cose* : *ose* (i. 281), *nascoso* : *gioso* (iii. 137), *cose* : *chiose* (iii. 160), *aviloppa* : *stoppa* (iii. 240), *cosa* : *osa* (iii. 394). *Longo* is a Latinism. The Bolognese development *u* > *o*, cf. Gaudenzi,² § 12, occurs in *ciascono*, *chioso*, *congionte*; *gioso* is a western and southern Tuscan form, cf. Grandgent,³ § 29. 4. *Groppo*, *agroppa*, show the normal Tuscan development *u* > *o*.

(4) U : U. *collui* : *nui* (i. 13), *tutte* : *condutte* (i. 33), *colui* : *nui* (i. 35), *ascusa* : *chiusa* (i. 58-9), *tutti* : *reduitti* (i. 192), *colui* : *sui* (i. 233), *altrui* : *nui* (i. 307), *a tutti* : *inducti* (i. 338), *reducte* : *tucte* (ii. 59), *lui* : *nui* (ii. 99), *reducti* : *tutti* (ii. 389), *tutti* : *reduitti* (iii. 208), *a nui* : *costui* (iii. 254). *Nui* is of Sicilian origin, but belongs to the traditional poetic language of the time. Also *ascusa* is a Sicilian form, as shown by *o* > *u*. *Condutte*, *inducti*, *reducte*, *reducti*, *reduitti*, are Latinisms. *Sui* is an Aretine form, cf. Parodi, *Rima siciliana*, *rima aretina e bolognese*, p. 134, besides being a Latinism, and is very frequent in early texts.

As already stated, in no case does Barberino's autograph manuscript show the imperfect rhyme *e* : *i*, *o* : *u*. Now as this was the practice of a well-known literary man writing at the time of the *stil nuovo*, his authority is of great weight. That Francesco da Barberino had a theory of linguistic hybridism does not detract from the importance of his manuscript as a witness. For the famous, and often quoted, passage in his *Reggimento e costumi di donna*:

E parlerai sol nel volgar toscano
e porrai mescolare alcun volgari
consonanti con esso,
di que' paesi, dov' ài più usato,
pigliando i belli e' non belli lasciando.⁴

only reflects what was the practice of Tuscan and Bolognese poets at the time, from Dante downwards.

R. WEISS

LONDON

¹ *Il Tristano Riccardiano*, ed. E. G. Parodi (Bologna, 1896).

² A. Gaudenzi, *I suoni, le forme e le parole dell' odierno dialetto della città di Bologna* (Torino, 1889).

³ C. H. Grandgent, *From Latin to Italian* (Cambridge, Mass. 1933).

⁴ F. da Barberino, *Del reggimento e costumi di donna*, ed. C. Baudi di Vesme (Bologna, 1875), p. 15.

PASCAL AND MIGUEL DE UNAMUNO

The year 1923 was the tercentenary of Pascal's birth, and in the *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale* for April-June of that year there appeared a number of articles on Pascal written by French philosophers of our times who acknowledged their debt to Pascal; the most important were those of Blondel, author of *L'Action*, who distinguished the 'volonté volante', or impulse, from the 'volonté voulue', or choice, and in his insistence on the fundamental antinomy in man's nature, which produces at the same time an exasperation at man's baseness and an exaltation at his divinity, is the modern echo of Pascal's 'Quelle chimère est-ce donc que l'homme!', and of Léon Brunschvicg, author of the classical edition of Pascal's *Pensées*. These two men are the greatest of Pascal's 'disciples' in France in the period after the 'Age of Reason', when reason became discredited, while intuition and personality were accepted as allies in man's search for reality.

At the end of the series, however, came a name less well known in France, that of Miguel de Unamuno, and at the end of his short article—it is only five pages long—one reads 'Salamanque, 1923', a city far removed from the main currents of learning in Europe in this first quarter of the twentieth century. Yet Miguel de Unamuno was one of the most eclectic scholars of our time, a multifarious reader and prompt to associate his readings with his own speculations. The article on Pascal, however, appears to show a special sympathy between these two minds with their personal, non-intellectual approaches to the problem of belief. This affinity appears in the opening phrase of Unamuno's contribution:

La lecture des écrits que nous a laissés Pascal, et surtout celle de ses *Pensées*, ne nous invite pas à étudier une philosophie, mais à connaître un homme, à pénétrer dans le sanctuaire d'universelle douleur d'une âme, d'une âme toute nue, et, mieux encore peut-être, d'une âme portant cilice.

He sees at once the risk he is running by making this approach; Pascal had written (*Pensée* 64 in the Brunschvicg edition), 'Ce n'est pas dans Montaigne, mais dans moi, que je trouve ce que j'y vois', so Unamuno may see in Pascal what resides only in himself; but this does not matter, since 'ce qui fait la force éternelle de Pascal, c'est qu'il y a autant de Pascal que d'hommes qui, en le lisant, le sentent et ne se limitent pas à le comprendre'.

Unamuno, himself a Basque, sees in Pascal the contrary influences of two Basques, the Abbé de Saint-Cyran and St Ignatius of Loyola, the Jansenist and the Jesuit. He quotes a letter from St Ignatius to the Brothers in Portugal, written in 1553, setting out the three degrees of obedience: (i) the mere execution of what is ordered, which has little virtue, (ii) making one's will conform with the will of the superior, and (iii) making one's whole feeling conform to that of the superior. In order to make this third degree of obedience rational, therefore easier for a thinking person, the Jesuits invented a form of probabilism, and it is against this probabilism that Pascal revolted, because he felt his own intellect forcing him to adopt it, thus destroying the faith for which he craved. Pascal's rebellious reason revolted against the third degree of obedience, but his feelings carried him towards it.

Pascal, qui se sentait intérieurement si peu soumis, qui n'arrivait pas à dompter sa raison, qui était peut-être persuadé, mais non convaincu, des dogmes catholiques, se parlait à lui-même de soumission. Il dit que celui qui ne se soumet pas où il faut n'entend point la force de la raison.

Submission, the repression of conclusions reached through the workings of the reason, is itself a working of the reason, since reason would not submit unless it judged that there are certain moments when it must submit. Further, the Pope detests learned men who do not submit willingly to his authority.

Pascal voulait se soumettre, il prêchait à lui-même la soumission, cependant qu'il cherchait en gémissant, qu'il cherchait sans trouver, et que le silence éternel des espaces l'effrayait. Sa foi était persuasion, non conviction.

Pascal's attitude towards faith is probably the cardinal point in Unamuno's article and in his whole view of Pascal. What does one mean by faith and believing? Is faith a conviction based on intellectual examination of data? No, indeed; Unamuno re-echoes Pascal's own words, '*c'est le cœur qui sent Dieu, et non la raison. Voilà ce que c'est que la foi; Dieu sensible au cœur, non à la raison*'. The simple folk who believe without having reasoned out their beliefs are inspired by God with a love for him and a hatred for their own sinful natures, he gives them the inclination to believe, '*il incline leur cœur à croire*'; one will never have '*une créance utile et de foi*' unless this inclination is present. The phrase '*une créance utile et de foi*' shows how non-intellectual Pascal's attitude is; he seeks not impartially for the truth, but for a belief which will help him, and deliver him from the power of his reason. How can he obtain such a belief? By submission, by forcing himself against his judgement to perform the mechanical observances of the Catholic faith, by doing things merely through habit. '*Cela vous fera croire et vous abêtira.—Mais c'est ce que je crains.—Et pourquoi? Qu'avez-vous à perdre?*' Here is a purely utilitarian point of view. It is also probabilist, since it calculates the chances of a successful result for an action, and, since it deals with chances, it deals with the purely irrational.

To the question 'Did Pascal really believe?' Unamuno's answer is that Pascal wanted to believe, had what William James called the 'will to believe', and this, says Unamuno, is the only faith possible for a man with a knowledge of mathematics, a clear reasoning faculty and the feeling for objective reality.

Pascal rebelled against the rational proofs of the existence of God, and recognized three sources of belief, reason, custom and inspiration. Pascal was never able to believe in God with his reason, says Unamuno, '*il ne s'est jamais convaincu de ce dont il était persuadé*'; therein lies his tragedy. There went on constantly in Pascal the conflict between scepticism and dogmatism; he chose the latter because it enabled him to acquire a faith which the former excluded. Pascal could never convince himself rationally of the reality of his '*connaissances de cœur*' and of the supernatural world which he made strenuous efforts to create; his state of mind, says Unamuno, is best illustrated by the verse in St Mark, chap. ix, verse 24, '*I, believe, O Lord, help thou mine unbelief*', which is not belief at all. To bring himself nearer to this belief, Pascal makes God immanent, makes him in-sist, not ex-sist, thus placing him out of reach of human reason.

Wherein lies the difference between this mental state and that of the Pyrrhonians whom Pascal attacked because he felt himself inwardly inclined to Pyrrhonism? asks Unamuno. The answer is that Pascal was never resigned to doubt and negation; he needed dogma and searched for it '*en s'abêtissant*'. His logic is polemic, not dialectic; he sought no synthesis between thesis and antithesis, but remained in a state of contradiction, conscious of an irremovable antinomy in human nature. '*Rien ne nous plaît tant que le combat, mais non pas la victoire.*' He feared that victory might be a victory of reason over faith. He was afraid of peace, which might bring him face to face with Nature, that is, reason.

In a complete man, is a faith possible which recognizes the possibility of demonstrating rationally the existence of God? Is St Ignatius's third degree of obedience possible? Only with grace, which is 'une autre tragique échappatoire'. Pascal prayed that his reason might assert itself less, and, like the 'will to believe', he had the 'will to submit'. Only in death, however, and through death, did he arrive at a reconciliation of the two powerful forces working within him. 'Et aujourd'hui', concludes Unamuno, 'il vit en ceux qui, comme nous, ont touché son âme toute nue avec la nudité de leur âme.'

In his work *La Agonía del Cristianismo*, published in 1931, Unamuno reprints this article in Spanish, with a literal translation of the original title of 'la foi pascalienne', and makes certain additions. The non-intellectual attitude is strengthened; what is philosophy? metaphysics, perhaps; but there is also 'la meterótica', that which is beyond love, which is also 'la metagónica', that which is beyond struggle and dreams (hence the title of *La Agonía del Cristianismo*). Pascal, the incarnation of contradiction and struggle, saw that the Jesuit doctrine of passive obedience and implicit faith removed from Christianity its combative aspect, and, consequently, its very life. Why, then, says Unamuno, did he say 'cela vous abêtira'? He was justified as a Christian in doing so in that, whereas a man may commit intellectual suicide ('suicidarse racionalmente'), he may not paralyse the reason of another individual, and this the Jesuits have done; further, in making others stupid and childish, they have made themselves stupid and childish, and Christianity is not alive and struggling in them, but dead and buried.

We have seen how Pascal interests Unamuno chiefly because Unamuno sees his own experience in that of Pascal; his contact is that of soul to soul, hence 'je vais vous présenter mon Pascal' (*Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, op. cit.). In chapter III of *La Agonía del Cristianismo* he says that to be Pascalian one must be Pascal; often when reading the works of another man he has exclaimed; '¡Pero esto he sido yo!'; not 'I have thought this' or even 'I have felt this', but 'I have been this'. He has lived again, he writes, with Pascal and Kierkegaard in their times, thus they are immortal through him and he will be immortal through others. The influence of Pascal on this attitude would be obvious even if Unamuno did not acknowledge it by the quotation (*Pensée* 64) already mentioned; Montaigne's soul lives again in Pascal, it is the same spirit in them all, as their souls make contact.

Not only is the heart our means of becoming conscious of the truth about another man, but it is also the channel through which we may become conscious of the truth about God. Pascal wrote, in 'De l'art de persuader' (*Pensées*, I, III),¹ concerning the 'vérités divines', '[Dieu] a voulu qu'elles entrent du cœur dans l'esprit, non pas de l'esprit dans le cœur, pour humilier cette superbe puissance du raisonnement, qui prétend devoir être juge des choses que la volonté choisit'. In *Del Sentimiento Trágico de la Vida*, Unamuno writes (IX, 162):²

Porque Dios sale al encuentro de quien le busca con amor y por amor, y se hurta de quien le inquiera por fría razón no amorosa. Quiere Dios que el corazón descansa, pero que no descansa la cabeza, ya que en la vida física duerme y descansa a veces la cabeza, y vela y trabaja arreo el corazón. Y así, la ciencia sin amor, nos aparta de Dios, y el amor, aun sin ciencia y acaso mejor sin ella, nos lleva a Dios; y por Dios a la sabiduría. ¡Bienaventurados los limpios de corazón, porque ellos verán a Dios!

¹ Unless otherwise stated, quotations are from the Firmin Didot edition of the *Pensées*, Paris, 1854. The first figure signifies first or second part, the second the 'article' or chapter.

² Roman figures refer to chapter, Arabic figures refer to page, in the Renacimiento edition, Buenos Aires, 1939.

The object of both these philosophers, then, each among the greatest intellects of his age, is to 'humiliate this haughty intellect'. Pascal shows us (I, III) how man, who prides himself on being governed entirely by reason, is in point of fact the slave of preconceived and accepted ideas and unaccountable desires, and that if one wishes to persuade a man of something, one must flatter his desires and fancies, for he is governed by them. Article VI of the second part of the *Pensées* deals with the 'soumission et usage de la raison'; the first sentence reads, 'la dernière démarche de la raison, c'est de connaître qu'il y a une infinité de choses qui la surpassent; elle est bien faible si elle ne va jusque-là'. A most important thing for reason to know is when to doubt, when to be certain, and when to be submissive, because if one does not know this one does not understand the force of reason. We may observe here that Pascal does not discredit reason altogether, since he writes in this article that those men abuse reason also who submit when they should exercise independent judgement. Similarly, immediately below, he writes: 'si on soumet tout à la raison, notre religion n'aura rien de mystérieux et de surnaturel' (and this, infers Pascal, would be an important lack), but also 'si on choque les principes de la raison, notre religion sera absurde et ridicule'. These supernatural promptings which come to the heart, but which the intellect cannot comprehend, are nevertheless difficult for the ordinary man to interpret correctly, since all emotional impulses are unreliable and may contradict former impulses; hence it is necessary for the reason to keep a check on those impulses, so that those which would cause us to perform actions or hold beliefs contrary to what we are rationally convinced is the truth will be dismissed as false. The difficulty, a difficulty which becomes the stronger in proportion as a man's intellect is more highly developed—and let us again remember that Pascal was probably the greatest scientist and Unamuno one of the most widely read scholars of their respective ages—the difficulty is that both these men became conscious of the great power of their intellects at a comparatively early age, and acquired the habit of placing every new thing in the searching light of reason; this habit persists—Pascal himself was only too familiar with the power of habits—and in order to obliterate its effects one must acquire another habit which will counteract it; 'il faut s'abêtir', as Unamuno constantly reminds himself and us. The knowledge gained through the heart is in any case more real than that arrived at through the operation of the intellect, says Pascal (II, I); 'plût à Dieu que nous n'en eussions au contraire jamais besoin, et que nous connussions toutes choses par instinct et par sentiment!' But Nature has refused us this boon, so we must supplement instinct with reason: 'les principes se sentent; les propositions se concluent; le tout avec certitude, quoique par différentes voies'. It is of no use for reason to demand proofs of these 'principes', and 'cette impuissance ne peut donc servir qu'à humilier la raison qui voudrait juger de tout; mais non pas à combattre notre certitude, comme s'il n'y avait que la raison capable de nous instruire'.

Unamuno's attitude towards our knowledge of reality is strongly influenced by that of Pascal which has been outlined above. At the beginning of *Del Sentimiento Trágico de la Vida* (I, 8), he writes that philosophy is nearer to poetry than to science, the latter being merely utilitarian, mechanical and outside us: 'nuestra filosofía, esto es, nuestro modo de comprender o de no comprender el mundo y la vida, brota de nuestro sentimiento de la vida misma' (I, 8). Man, he says, is commonly described as a thinking animal, but it might be more accurate to describe him as an affective or feeling animal ('un animal afectivo o sentimental', I, 8). It is feeling, not reason, perhaps, which distinguishes man from the animals:

'más veces he visto razonar a un gato que no reír o llorar' (I, 8). Later (op. cit. VI, 101), he writes: 'Lo que siento es la verdad, tan verdad por lo menos como lo que veo, toco y oigo y se me demuestra—yo creo que más verdad aún—y la sinceridad me obliga a no ocultar mis sentimientos.'

Thus the humbling of the intellect, on which Pascal and Unamuno insist, is necessary if one wishes to rise to the greatest heights of human experience, particularly if one hopes for faith in God. Pascal writes (I, VII, VII): 'Ceux qui croient sans avoir examiné les preuves de la religion, croient parce qu'ils ont une disposition toute sainte... Ils sentent qu'un Dieu les a faits.' God comes to these people through a divine propensity, and they have the good fortune not to be sufficiently intelligent to crush the divine impulse: they are able to attain to faith, whereas the intellectual man refuses to believe until proofs can be produced, and consequently never has faith (while he maintains this attitude) because there is no satisfactory rational proof of the existence of God, since the metaphysical proofs are far above the reach of most men, and at best only give a speculative knowledge of God (II, xv, II). 'On ne croira jamais d'une créance utile et de foi si Dieu n'incline le cœur, et on croira dès qu'il l'inclinera' (*Pensées*, II, VI, VII); as we have already seen above, Unamuno quotes this sentence to show that Pascal's search is not for objective truth, since an objective thinker detaches himself from his own needs and desires, and truth remains something divorced from his personality. Pascal's nature was too warm to be satisfied with the cold yieldings of reason, and much as he would like to have had a basis of reason for his beliefs, he could never construct one; Unamuno reminds us (*Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*) how he sadly writes, 'si la raison était raisonnable...'. Whatever may be the base on which it be founded, however, Pascal craves for his belief in God, a personal, comforting God, 'un Dieu de consolation... un Dieu qui remplit l'âme et le cœur qu'il possède', and not merely a sort of mathematician who created the truths of geometry and the order of the elements, which is a pagan conception (*Pensées*, II, xv, II).

Just as Pascal's head drew him towards the mathematical type of God, while his heart pulled him away to the loving and consoling type, producing in him a perpetual tension and feeling of contradiction, so Unamuno felt within him two powerful and opposing tendencies. In *Del Sentimiento Trágico de la Vida* he writes (IV, 65):

La razón ataca, y la fe, que no se siente sin ella segura, tiene que pactar con ella. Y de aquí vienen las trágicas contradicciones y las desgarraduras de conciencia.*

In order to gain for faith the better part of the bargain, the element of will must be present. In fact, faith is

en su esencia... cosa de voluntad, no de razón, como creer es querer creer, y creer en Dios ante todo y sobre todo es querer que le haga. Y así, creer en la inmortalidad del alma es querer que el alma sea inmortal, pero quererlo con tanta fuerza que esta querencia, atropellando a la razón, pasa sobre ella (VI, 99).

In vol. II of his *Ensayos*, published in 1916, Unamuno devotes an entire chapter (chap. VIII) to his conception of faith. He boldly re-asserts the will aspect of faith; faith, he says, 'no es creer lo que no vemos, sino crear lo que no vemos, si, crearlo, vivirlo, consumirlo, y volver a crearlo'; this is 'un incesante tormento vital'. We are reminded by this passage of Pascal, 'je ne puis approuver que ceux qui cherchent en gémissant'. 'La fe es la conciencia de la vida de nuestro espíritu', says Unamuno

(op. cit.), and creation is life, so we must be constantly creating in order to maintain life. This feeling of spiritual vitality which came to Unamuno sometimes, and which his reason could not repress, corresponds to what Pascal calls 'l'instinct qui nous élève'; it is the 'instinct qui nous élève' which inspired Unamuno to write (op. cit.) that faith seeks the impossible, the absolute, the infinite, the eternal, a full life, and it is his 'incesante tormento vital' which he felt when trying to make clear to himself this essentially ideal conception, which can scarcely be other than incommunicable.

One of the reasons why Unamuno's faith is incommunicable is that it is so intensely personal. An intellectual conception of God would be demonstrable and explicable in its entirety, and would be independent of any subjective considerations. Unamuno's faith, however, and his efforts to attain to faith, are dependent on the assertion of his personality, and in this he shows a decided Pascalian influence. We remember how Pascal saw that men constantly try to be a self different from their own (I, v, III), and Unamuno in the Prologue to his *Tres Novelas Ejemplares y un Prólogo* shows that Juan is not one individual but three, Juan as he sees himself, Juan as others see him, and the real Juan, who may be hidden from everyone, including Juan himself, and this division of personality precludes any effort at self-assertion in his case.

In chap. VIII of the *Ensayos*, vol. II, Unamuno writes that the individual will obtain faith when he finds his own true life and pursues it. The maintenance of the continuity of this life is the very being of the individual (*Del Sentimiento Trágico de la Vida*, I, 11 et seq.), and Unamuno cannot understand an individual desiring to be someone else (op. cit. I, 13, vide *Pensées*, I, v, III above). He has 'una furiosa hambre de ser'; similarly (*Sentimiento Trágico de la Vida*, III, 38), '¡ser, ser siempre, ser sin término! ¡sed de ser, sed de ser más! ¡hambre de Dios! ¡sed de amor eternizante y eterno! ¡ser siempre! ¡ser Dios!' Well does Unamuno entitle this chapter 'Hambre de inmortalidad'.

Pascal, too, felt the hunger for immortality; we see his image of himself transported to an unknown island whose inhabitants are as uninformed as he is of their whereabouts, and some of them become as attached to objects on the island and become indifferent to their fate, which he cannot do because he feels impelled to seek the eternal truth, and is downcast because he, like man in the universe, is in the unfortunate position of 'voyant trop pour nier, et trop peu pour m'assurer' (II, VII). Like Pascal, whom he quotes (*Sentimiento Trágico de la Vida*, III, 39), Unamuno cannot understand the spiritually dissipated individual who professes not to care a straw for his own immortality; 'y el que así siente es para mí, como para Pascal, cuyas son las palabras señaladas, "un monstruo"' (loc. cit.).

Yo no diré que sean las doctrinas más o menos poéticas o infilosóficas que voy a exponer, las que me hacen vivir; pero me atrevo a decir que es mi anhelo de vivir y de vivir por siempre el que me inspira esas doctrinas (*Sentimiento Trágico de la Vida*, VI, 111).

Only human destiny will kill him, he will never willingly let himself die (ibid.).

It is this 'anhelo de vivir' which is manifested in William James's 'will to believe', but here we have a difficulty. Assuming that this 'will to believe' or 'will to live spiritually' may be established, can it be maintained at an equal strength? Must not doubt assail men sometimes? Yes, indeed, says Unamuno (*Agonía del Cristianismo*, chap. III), faith that does not doubt is a dead faith. *Dubitare*, says Unamuno (ibid.), contains the same root as *duo* and *duellum*, thus showing its

parentage with duality and with struggle, 'la dualidad del combate'. The word 'agonía' from the title of this work also means 'struggle', hence there is a double emphasis on the struggle element in religion. Self-assertion, the 'will to believe', the rebellious reason to be conquered, all these demand a constant struggle, and in chap. II of *La Agonía del Cristianismo* Unamuno quotes St Matthew x. 34, 'Do not think that I came to send peace on earth. I came not to send peace, but the sword.' Peace comes in struggle, and struggle in peace (op. cit. vi). Struggle is life, life is virility, virility produces the desire to create, to create something in which to believe, 'ganas de creer', which is comparable to St John of the Cross' 'apetito de Dios'. A living faith is a will to know which changes into a desire to love, 'una voluntad de comprender que se hace una comprensión de la voluntad' (ibid.).

Yet virility by itself is sterile, the final stage of faith is passive, the acceptance by the soul of grace divinely sent; see here a close approximation to the Jansenist view—Pascal writes (II, xvi) that only those know God to whom Christ has revealed him. In the verse 'I believe, O Lord, help thou mine unbelief' (St Mark ix. 24, quoted above), the first half is the moment of virility, since 'I believe' is not literally faith but 'will to believe', whereas the second half is the moment of femininity, passivity, grace; the first leads to the second, the second leads to faith. Pascal's ardent search for a belief was virility, his submission of the intellect was femininity, but, as Unamuno tells us in his article of 1923, Pascal never entirely succeeded in submitting, therefore he never reached a really firm faith.

The synthesis of these extracts is that faith is a peace that may come to us if we struggle manfully to attain to it, but to which we shall not attain otherwise. Pascal and Unamuno agree that the mind, if it is enthroned as the supreme judge in matters of belief, can prevent us from becoming conscious of God, and that we must therefore confine it to its proper sphere, since the truth comes to us through the heart (*Pensées*, I, III), and 'le cœur a ses raisons que la raison ne connaît pas' (II, xvii). The determination that the heart shall be heard is seen again in Unamuno's sonnet 'Razón y Fe' (from the *Rosario de Sonetos Líricos*):

Levanta de fe el blanco estandarte
sobre el polvo que cubre la batalla,
mientras la ciencia parlotea, y calla
y oye sabiduría y obra el arte.

Hay que vivir y es fuerza esforzarte,
a pelear contra la vil canalla
que se anima al restalle de la tralla
y ¡hay que morir! exclama. Pon tu parte
y la de Dios espera, que abomina
del que cede. Tu ensangrentada huella
por los mortales campos encamina

hacia el fulgor de tu eternal estrella;
hay que ganar la vida que no fina,
con razón, sin razón o contra ella.

The parallel between line 8 and Pascal's wager will at once be observed; for both Unamuno and Pascal the will to believe was all the greater if one openly took what appeared to be a losing wager, if one could constantly contend with hostile factors. 'Rien ne nous plaît tant que le combat.'

Faith, then, depends upon our putting forth great efforts, say Pascal and Unamuno, in order that we may become conscious, through the feelings, not through

the reason, of the God within us. Pascal calls upon those who spend all their time in worldly pursuits to read something about God, and see whether they are not roused to some realization of higher truth and prompted to make further efforts (II, II). This realization, which is the tragic sense of life of which the great 'feelers' (as opposed to thinkers, the distinction drawn by Madariaga in *The Genius of Spain*) are conscious, is the incentive to struggle for a belief. Unamuno writes (*Sentimiento Trágico de la Vida*, ix, 173): 'Creer en Dios es amarle, y amarle es sentirle sufriente, compadecerle.' God, confined in brute matter and limited by the unconscious mind, is constantly trying to get free, and we should exert all our efforts in helping him to get free. 'La congoja religiosa no es sino el divino sufrimiento, sentir que Dios sufre en mí, y que yo sufro en él' (loc. cit.). When the individual has by constant effort removed the repression which the mind and the senses exert on this divinity, he will have his faith. Unamuno's closing words in *Del Sentimiento Trágico de la Vida* leave the reader with an encouragement to go forward with the struggle: '¡Y Dios no te dé paz, y sí gloria!'

F. R. MARTIN

SOUTHAMPTON

GOETHE'S FRIENDSHIP WITH ANTHONY O'HARA

A few years ago, the life story of Anthony O'Hara, one of the most remarkable descendants of the Wild Geese, was published by Valentine O'Hara,¹ a story which offers various aspects of topical interest. Anthony O'Hara fought with the Russian army when the Crimea was first conquered. He became the Tsar's last Ambassador to the Sovereign and Independent Military Order of the Knights of St John at Malta, and was the only one of the knights to stand up for his Grand-Master when the French usurped power in Valetta. Persecuted by the personal hatred of Napoleon Bonaparte he had to withdraw to Russia, but there the jealousy of Russian and British diplomats made his life most unhappy. Eventually he was granted a pension and retired to Bohemia, where, for the previous two hundred years, Irish noble families such as the Butlers (descending from the Colonel Butler immortalized by Schiller's *Wallenstein*), O'Kellys and Taaffes, the latter distant relatives of O'Hara, held prominent positions. Valentine O'Hara's story of her great ancestor closes with the early months of 1810. 'Just here, on the eve of what looked like Anthony O'Hara's last adventure in this world, his brief chronicle (on which her book is mainly based) ends abruptly.' In the last letter published by Valentine O'Hara, Anthony writes from Prague on 4 April 1810, to his cousin Charles O'Hara of Ballyhara, County Sligo, to tell him that, after the capitulation of Vienna, he had left for Teplitz, one of the then fashionable watering-places in Northern Bohemia. 'In November', he adds, 'I came here [to Prague]. Next month I hope to be at the Baths² once more. Meanwhile I can make no definite plans for the future.' Valentine O'Hara concludes her book as follows:

This is the last glimpse we get of Anthony O'Hara. As he quits the scene, our thoughts and wishes follow him to Teplitz where, let us hope, he had many more opportunities of benefiting from its healthy waters and also of enjoying life in what for him constituted the best of company—*la bonne société*—moving within the orbit of a brilliant court like that of Dresden—a leisurous, sheltered existence, varied no doubt, by further excursions farther afield.

It is strange that the immediate continuance of Anthony's life story can be traced in a source which whilst being most unexpected is certainly of the greatest literary interest. When recently tracing 'Goethe's personal relations with Ireland' (in *The Dublin Magazine*, January-March, 1943, pp. 45-56), I mentioned that one of the first inducements to Goethe's study of the antiquities of Ireland was the present given him by Anthony O'Hara of O'Halloran's famous work.

On the year 1811 in his *Tag- und Jahreshefte* (Weimar edition, section I, vol. xxxvi, p. 70 f.) Goethe notes:

Von Personen, die dieses Jahr in Weimar eingesprochen, find' ich folgende bemerkt. . . . Ritter³ Ohara, ein trefflicher Gesellschafter, guter Wirth und Ehrenmann, wählte Weimar für einige Zeit zu seinem Wohnort. Die Geschichte seiner vieljährigen Irrfahrten, die er mit einigem Scherz über sich selbst zu würzen verstand, verbreiteten über seine Tafel einen angenehmen vertraulichen Ton. Daß seine Köchin die trefflichsten Beef-steaks zu bereiten wußte, auch daß er mit dem echtensten Mokka-Kaffee seine Gastmähle schloß, ward ihm nicht zum geringen Verdienst angerechnet.

¹ *Anthony O'Hara*, by Valentine O'Hara, London, 1939. The authoress overlooked the valuable material on the Irish O'Haras found in O'Rourke's *History of Ballysodare and Kilmarnet*.

² The editor conjectures Teplitz.

³ A few years before, another Knight of Malta had stayed at Weimar. His name was James

Lawrence and, in a letter to Carlyle (15 January 1822), Goethe refers to him as 'an old friend who regularly returns to Weimar'. See Alford in *Publications of the English Goethe-Society*, vi, pp. 132 ff. Lawrence left us a description of his internment at Verdun; see C. Maxwell, *English Travellers in France*, pp. 247 and 284.

In Goethe's diaries, the first reference to Anthony O'Hara is found as early as 28 May 1810 (Weimar edition, section III, vol. iv, p. 126), when, a few days after his arrival at Carlsbad, Goethe was invited by the Chevalier O'Hara to tea. He was there together with the Countess Potacka, wife of Stanislaus Kostka Potacki, a Polish nobleman in Russian service, and Count and Countess Razumowsky (Alexej Cyrillowitch Razumowsky was at that time Russian minister of education). There was also the Rev. Mr O'Kelly, an offspring of the O'Kellys in Bohemia (with whom Mr Seán T. O'Kelly, Éire's Minister for Finance, is related), who probably on account of his relationship with Count Marcolini, an influential Saxon diplomat who was married to his sister, had become the confessor of Queen Amalie of Saxony. (The rulers of Saxony, the native country of the Reformation, had, a hundred and fifty years before, turned Catholic in order to attain the royal dignity of Poland. Amalie, wife of Frederic Augustus III, who had become king of Saxony a few years before by the grace of Napoleon, belonged to the Catholic Wittelsbachs of Zweibrücken.) A few days previously Goethe had mentioned O'Kelly in his capacity as 'confessor to the Queen of Saxony' among his new acquaintances (*ibid.* p. 124). Upon 15 June, Goethe mentions O'Kelly's departure from Carlsbad.

As was usual on his meeting a person, Goethe gives in his diaries the main topics of conversation (*ibid.* p. 126): 'Abdruck schöner Gemmen die im Besitz von beyden Damen' (the above-mentioned countesses?). Then he continues:

Humoristische Erzählung des Chevaliers von einem Abenteuer, das ihm mit einem russischen Pfaffen begegnet, der ihn in den Katakomben von Kiew herumgeführt und ihn für einen Muhamedaner erklärt, weil er das Kreuz von der Rechten zur Linken bey den heiligen Gräbern [of St Vladimir] gemacht.

Anthony O'Hara had been in Kiev probably on the occasion of the First Crimean War. Was he aware of the fact that seven hundred years previously countrymen of his had been established there in a monastery ministering to the German traders? Like his father Charles and his mother, a French lady, Anthony O'Hara was a Roman Catholic. (Only the Northern branch of the O'Haras became Protestants.)

On 29 May 1810, Count Razumowsky returned the Knight's hospitality and, together with O'Hara, Goethe was invited for tea, and so was O'Kelly (*ibid.* p. 127). Again Anthony O'Hara entertained the party with a funny story: 'wie (er) diesen Morgen der Prinzessin den Teufel in die Hand practizirt und sie damit promenieren muß'. (The princess referred to was Marianne of Saxony, 1761-1820.) O'Hara probably told also the fable subsequently mentioned by Goethe: 'daß ein Flötenspieler in den Latomien die Canons erfunden habe, indem das Echo successiv und in conconirenden Intervallen seine Melodien nachbrachte'. On 30 May, Goethe, O'Hara and O'Kelly stayed with the Razumowskys for lunch, and they afterwards examined the Count's famous collection of gems (*ibid.*).

On 6 June, Goethe had lunch with Anthony O'Hara, and this was probably the first occasion when they were alone together (*ibid.* p. 130). On the following day Goethe 'witnessed a discussion between Prince Lichnowsky [Charles Lichnowsky, 1758-1814] and O'Hara about the right of confiscation of ecclesiastical property' (*ibid.*). As there can be no doubt that O'Hara held the conservative view, we may assume that Prince Lichnowsky defended the principles of the late Emperor Joseph of Austria, his benefactor and sovereign. On 9 June, Goethe makes the most interesting entry in his diary: 'Das von O'Hara erhaltene Buch über die Irländischen Barden gelesen und einiges extrahirt'. On the following day, Goethe again met O'Hara and O'Kelly at lunch at Prince Lichnowsky's and, when afterwards going for a walk together, they 'met the Empress [of Austria] and followed her into the

hall' (ibid. p. 131). Two days later, Goethe writes: 'Früh am Brunnen. Nachher bey Müller die Irischen Barden' (ibid.). Since there is no comma or period between the word 'Müller' and 'die Irischen Barden', we must assume that Goethe discussed the book given to him by O'Hara with Joseph Müller, a gem-dealer at Carlsbad, at that time a man of over eighty years. In his *Tag- und Jahreshefte* 1811, Goethe said that Müller was 'in hohen Jahren, nicht mehr anregend' (Weimar edition, section I, vol. xxxvi, p. 68).

On 15 June, Goethe mentions that the title of the book which he is reading is 'Irländische Antiquitäten' (Weimar edition, section III, vol. iv, p. 132), and, four days later, he states its full title as 'O'Halloran Einleitung zu der Geschichte und den Antiquitäten von Irland' (*Introduction to the Study of the History and Antiquities of Ireland*). The correct English title of O'Halloran's work (the author's name being erroneously spelt o Halloran) is found in a note-book containing Goethe's literary notes from the years 1805 to 1823 (Weimar edition, section I, vol. lxxx, p. 444). Here Goethe adds that he read that work in the edition published (by J. Murray) in 1772 in London. (In the same year, O'Halloran's book was also published by Thomas Ewing at Dublin.) In that note-book Goethe, moreover, gives a short appreciation of O'Halloran's work, calling it 'ein in seiner Art musterhaft geschriebenes Buch; der Verfasser vertheidigt seine Nation gegen den Stolz und die Misreden der Engländer'. This latter sentence was obviously written under the fresh impression of the beginning of O'Halloran's *Antiquities*; in the preliminary discourse the author makes his aim quite clear:

Having a natural reverence for the dignity and antiquity of my native country... I could not without the greatest pain and indignation, behold on the one part almost all the writers of England and Scotland (and from them of other parts of Europe) represent the Irish nation as the most brutal and savage of mankind... and, on the other hand, the extreme passiveness and insensibility of the present race of Ireland at such reiterated insulting offences to truth and their country, unexampled in any other civilised country.

In the 'Advertisement' to the second edition of his work, which appeared in 1803 in Dublin as the first volume of a collective edition of his works on Irish history, O'Halloran said that, whilst

being written at a time when, and for centuries before, the Saxon race, with the most un-exemplated asperity and cruelty made such charges on the whole Irish nation, as none but the most depraved and irritable characters could even conceive [the last phrase in italics], his work soon spread over the continent and was everywhere received with high approbation. The author received compliments of a very flattering nature from some of the most distinguished characters of France and Italy, who also observed, that this new source of information came from a quarter least expected!

In the list of subscribers to O'Halloran's *History of Ireland* we find a great number of names from Spain and also the name of 'His Excellency Count Lacy [a Limerick man], Ambassador to Russia', but neither O'Halloran nor that list make any reference to Germany. We may, however, assume that O'Halloran's work met with considerable interest in that country where, mainly on account of Herder, Goethe's master and friend, the foundations for a scholarly study of the ancient history and literature of Ireland were about to be laid. However, it is remarkable that Goethe was presented with that work by a person of Irish extraction. Perhaps this was not the first time that Goethe's interest in the antiquities of Ireland had been aroused by a person of Irish descent. It was as early as 1771 that, in Herder's circle in Strasbourg, Goethe met his Saxon-born friend O'Feral (*Der junge Goethe*, II, 119 and VI, 183), who may have been instrumental in leading Herder and

Goethe to a first study of the Gaelic language. More than any other line of Goethe's universal studies, his interest in Ireland and her antiquities was based on personal relations rather than on book-knowledge.

Whether O'Feral was still aware of his Irish descent we do not know. We do know that Anthony O'Hara, at the age of forty, a few years previous to his meeting with Goethe, had to investigate and obtain proofs of his Irish lineage and noble birth for his admission to the Order of St John. On that occasion O'Hara for the first time discovered and contacted his relations in Bohemia and Ireland. The fact that he nevertheless took an interest in Goethe's knowledge of Ireland is even more remarkable when we consider that O'Halloran's political views were diametrically opposed to his own conservatism, as is clear from a letter, written in 1799, to his cousin:

It grieves me sorely to see that in our own country the same regicides have succeeded in propagating the infernal spirit of revolution and in seducing some of the people of our province of Connaught from their allegiance. These Irish gentlemen forget their duty and their religion.

O'Halloran's work provided Goethe with a certain knowledge of the history of Ireland up to the Anglo-Norman invasion, especially of Druidism, the Milesian period, St Patrick's mission and the coming of the English. It is remarkable that this early work on Irish history should show quite clearly that the decisive incision in Irish history lies in the middle of what in other national histories of Europe is called the period of the Middle Ages, and that this incision is here found in the Anglo-Norman invasion. A few months before coming across O'Halloran's work, Goethe had written to his friend Caroline Sartorius:

Ihrem theuren Gatten empfehlen Sie mich auf's beste... Möchte er mir doch einige Nachricht von den englischen und irländischen Klosterstudien geben können aus jener dunklen Zeit, von der man wenig weiß. Wäre es auch nur Nachricht, daß man nicht viel wisse (7 November 1808, Weimar edition, section IV, vol. xxx, p. 117).

In 1793, Sartorius had published the first German translation of Adam Smith's work, and in later years he wrote a history of the Hanseatic League. From Goethe's letter we learn that he was also engaged in medieval studies, but of these nothing apparently has actually been published. In 1814, Sartorius became professor of political science, and in this capacity he played a prominent part in the conflict between the king and his people. His wife was forty years younger than he, but both of them died a few years earlier than Goethe.

Through O'Halloran's work Goethe also became better acquainted with the centuries-old controversies between the Irish and Scottish historians regarding early Celtic history, a subject which was well known to him from his early studies of Macpherson's *Ossian* and especially from an article which as late as 1795 Herder had published in Schiller's *Horen* concerning those controversies. Another point of special interest to Goethe must have been O'Halloran's defence of the unity of the Irish race. Perhaps O'Halloran's arguments incited Goethe to the comparative study of the English and Irish character which underlies his appreciation of Goldsmith and Sterne.

It appears that the reading of O'Halloran's book took Goethe about a week. Unfortunately the notes he took from that reading have not been preserved. It is noteworthy, however, that he apparently started his study of that work immediately after having received it from O'Hara. During the subsequent month, Goethe frequently mentions Anthony O'Hara in his diaries. On 21 June, they

lunched together in the company of Mme Lâmel, wife of a Prague banker, and Mme Keil, wife of a citizen of Carlsbad (Weimar edition, section III, vol. iv, p. 134). On 25 June, O'Hara again invited Goethe for lunch, together with Count Lichnowsky and Adoduroff, a Russian general (ibid. p. 135). On 2 July, O'Hara met Goethe after lunch at his home and they went together to Countess Branicka for tea (ibid. p. 136). On 6 July, O'Hara and some other friends were with Goethe after lunch (ibid. p. 138). A week later, Goethe departed from Carlsbad, but this did not conclude their relations.

On 27 December of the same year, Goethe mentions O'Hara as having arrived at the court of Weimar, when at lunch Anthony and the Duke vied in entertaining the party with 'Russian stories' (ibid. p. 174). On 29 December, the Chevalier joined Goethe after lunch and, in the evening, Goethe met O'Hara at his home and they both walked together to the theatre (ibid. p. 175). On the following day there was a 'great party' in Goethe's house, and the Chevalier is the first of the distinguished guests to be mentioned in the diary (ibid.). It is strange that on the subsequent day, New Year's Eve, Goethe enters: 'Bey Hofe Chevalier O'Hara zum erstenmal daselbst' (ibid.). Had the party mentioned upon 27 December no official character? At the beginning of the new year, Goethe procured accommodation for Chevalier O'Hara, and a few days later, O'Hara again appears at a party in Goethe's house (ibid. pp. 176-7). On 14 February, Goethe paid his first visit to O'Hara's new lodgings, where four days later they had lunch together with Fräulein Reitzenstein, a noble Saxon lady living in Weimar, and Fräulein Maria von Teubern, the translator of Carlyle's life of Schiller (ibid. p. 186). On 4 March, Goethe had lunch at O'Hara's together with Dr Osborne (ibid. p. 189), whom as early as 1807 Goethe had recommended as

Gentilhomme Anglois, qui a été depuis 30 ans Membre de la Société royale à Londres, et élu deux fois du Conseil, voyageant pour cultiver les sciences. Il est Docteur des Loix angloises dans les deux Universités d'Oxford et Cambridge (Weimar edition, section IV, vol. xix, p. 508).

Goethe also mentions that 'the ladies of the house' were present. These ladies are also referred to upon 23 March, when, on a walk with the Duke, Goethe met O'Hara: 'die Frauenzimmer waren nach Jena gefahren' (Weimar edition, section III, vol. iv, p. 193). Further visits are mentioned upon 18 April, 8 and 11 May, and upon 31 May, a few days after his arrival in Carlsbad, Goethe enters: 'Chev. Ohara [sic!] kam an' (ibid. p. 210). On 5 June, O'Hara spent the evening in Goethe's lodgings, and on 22 June, Goethe accompanied him to Countess Protasoff, a member of the Russian court, and they went for an excursion with the ladies (ibid. pp. 211, 214). On 28 June, an hour before his departure from Carlsbad, Goethe saw O'Hara, who transmitted to him a message from Countess Protasoff asking for Goethe's advice regarding her journey from Carlsbad to Central Germany. Accordingly, two days later we find the entry: 'Angekommen gegen 3 Uhr in Schleiz. An Chevalier O'Hara nach Carlsbad wegen der Retour der gräfin Protasoff' (ibid. p. 216). From that entry we may conclude that for her return to Russia the countess wished to travel via Thuringia and Prussia, instead of taking her route through the Kingdom of Saxony, which, closely allied as it was to Napoleon, would not have been a safe place for a Russian lady in those days when the campaign against Russia was just about to begin. Goethe's letter to O'Hara was published in the Weimar edition under No. 6164 (section IV, vol. xxii, pp. 124-5). It describes the various difficulties which a foreign traveller met at that time when Thuringia consisted of a dozen miniature duchies. Schleiz was the capital of the duchy of

Reuss, the smallest of the countries of Germany and incidentally the last to submit to Bismarck. Goethe recommends the countess to an inn in Schleiz and he concludes:

Pardonnez, mon cher ami, la prolixité de mon mémoire. Ce n'est que pour remplir mon devoir vis à vis de Vous et d'une Dame vénérable que je compte d'avoir l'honneur de recevoir à Weimar. Vous aurez la bonté de remettre l'incluse à ma petite femme, qui en partant de Carlsbad n'aura d'autre regret que de s'être toujours trouvé dans la nécessité de vous parler par interprète.

There are only two more mentions of O'Hara in Goethe's diaries. Upon 5 July, he writes that he sent a letter with a billet and box from the Chevalier O'Hara to Countess Henckell (Weimar edition, section III, vol. iv, p. 217). This letter has not been traced and thus we are ignorant of the contents. We may, however, assume that O'Hara made the countess' acquaintance during his sojourn in Weimar. When he departed the countess probably asked him a favour, perhaps to buy some fashionable material at Carlsbad, a place which to the noble but poorly circumstanced lady of that time must have appeared as heaven on earth. Moreover, it appears that, in 1811, foreign materials were much cheaper in Carlsbad than in Weimar. The reason for this is given by Goethe in his summary of the time he spent in Carlsbad (*Tag- und Jahreshefte*, 1811 (Weimar edition, section I, vol. xxxvi, pp. 68-9)):

In Gesellschaft von lebenslustigen Freunden und Freundinnen übergab ich mich einer tagverzehrenden Zerstreuung... Bei dem niedrigen Stande des Papiergeldes, fast wie Zehn gegen Eins, trank man eine anmuthige Flasche Ungarwein für den Betrag von wenig Silbergroschen....

O'Hara's relations with Countess Henckell are of special interest because the countess was the grandmother of Ottilie, who was to become Goethe's daughter-in-law and who, in later years, was famous for her passion for Ireland and Irishmen.

The last reference made to O'Hara in Goethe's diaries is found under 17 October 1822 (Weimar edition, section III, vol. viii, p. 251): 'Abends Professor Riemer [then librarian at Weimar], O'Hara's Nachrichten von Napoleon erzählend.' As was mentioned above, after the fall of Malta, O'Hara had to flee continuously from Napoleon's personal hatred. From Goethe's letter to O'Hara in 1811 we may conclude that he did not expect Anthony to return to Weimar, but from that last entry we see that his memory lived for a long time at the court of Weimar.¹ During later years numerous Irishmen visited Goethe; all of these belonged to the Protestant ascendancy.

JOHN HENNIG

DUBLIN

¹ In the diaries of Ottilie (published in 1910 by W. v. Oettingen) mention is made of J. M. Banim's *Tales of the O'Hara Family*; the first volume of these appeared in 1825. See Stephen Brown, S.J., *Ireland in Fiction*, p. 22.

SYMBOLISM IN HÖLDERLIN'S POETRY 1800-1804

In the poetry belonging to the years 1800-1804, Hölderlin's last period before his madness, there is little to distinguish it from the poetry of the previous period, so far as the subject-matter is concerned. The themes are the same, but in their treatment, in the views which Hölderlin now expresses and in his form and style, an astonishing advance is noticeable. His thoughts become more individual, and it is no longer apposite, or usually possible, to trace them to any external source. He has arrived at that period of maturity when his knowledge and vision, nourished and sustained in his formative years, have become his intrinsic possession, absorbed into his very being. His growth as a poet is complete and it only remains for him to find the adequate poetic expression of his world of thought and feeling.

If we examine the poems which he wrote in this period, we can see him rapidly acquiring mastery over his medium. In a short time he achieves command of rhythm, nuance, direct and indirect appeal, reflective and emotional utterance. Hölderlin is now a master of simple statements as well as of complicated and intricate periods, of the arresting word as of suggestive word-combinations, of subtle emphases and harsh accents. Above all he is a consummate master of the poetic elaboration of thought.

The pursuit of a thought through its many ramifications is the essence of Hölderlin's mature poetry. In his surest manner he leads up to his central thought by explaining the circumstances in which the thought came to him or by describing the object which suggested it, as for example in 'Der Rhein', 'Brot und Wein', 'Der Archipelagus'. Then he develops his theme, not simply and logically, but with due regard for the poet's associative and discursive mode of thinking.¹ Not one of these divagations is in fact irrelevant in his best poetry, but all form an essential part of the poetic whole. It is not as a rule easy to follow the steps of Hölderlin's 'argument', but it is necessary that each of them should be borne in mind, if the poem is to produce its effect as a whole. The reader must put himself in the place of the poet and follow the poet's train of thought as if it were his own.

Hölderlin's poetry in this stage is not intended for ordinary readers,² and a great part of it was not published by him. His poems are now not a presentation of thoughts and feelings for those who are called upon to understand and sympathize and for whom these thoughts and feelings are made intelligible by means of simplification. It is rather as though Hölderlin were making them clear to himself alone by allowing them full scope. In this self-communion he never loses sight of the central idea, so that he also exercises a control over his train of thought by observing it and never allowing it to become incoherent. Hölderlin is careful to establish in his poetry the links between one direction of his thought and another (hence his characteristic use of particles like *wenn*, *aber*, etc.) and to preserve in language the passages that lead from one to the other. It is only when he succumbs more and more to his disease that the bridge from one element of thought to another, the connecting links in his poetry, become obscured and his verse remains

¹ Cf. M. Bertaux' admirable formulation (*Hölderlin, Essai de biographie intérieure*, Paris, 1936, p. 318): 'Ce qui précisément marque le caractère nouveau de la poésie hymnique, c'est que le poète ne conçoit pas d'avance, ne construit pas sur plan le mouvement de son poème; il en poursuit le mouvement dans l'exécution, il

se laisse porter par ce mouvement même. Il ne s'agit plus d'architecture, mais de chant.... Le développement suit non plus une loi d'équilibre, mais la loi de l'inspiration.'

² Cf. N. v. Hellingrath, *Hölderlin-Vermächtnis*, ed. L. v. Pigenot, 1936, p. 161, and W. Böhm, *Hölderlin*, Vol. II, p. 359.

unintelligible, as in 'Der Ister'. In this poem the river symbol loses its poetic value and fails to clarify Hölderlin's thought.¹

In this final stage Hölderlin's train of thought is not clear to himself and his poetry (if such it can still be called) is a vain struggle to render articulate the thought that is evidently still pulsating within him. These fragments are not devoid of poetic beauty,² but we cannot treat them as poetry. They are documents revealing the fate of a man, not his art, and treating them would mean drawing attention away from the poet to the man. Hölderlin's end does not help us to understand his beginnings or his maturity, and it is therefore wise to disregard his work after the second version of 'Patmos'. This is the last poem that is a valid expression of his poetic thought. The rest is the faltering speech of a decomposing mind.

An examination of Hölderlin's use of symbols in this final period of his poetic work will reveal several new features. Not that there is a fundamental change, inasmuch as there is no change in the themes of his poetry. The attitude which we have hitherto observed is fully maintained. But Hölderlin's technical mastery has grown, and we may look for an extension of his former practice.

There is an illuminating remark on one of the poems belonging to this period, 'Der Rhein', written by Hölderlin in one of the manuscripts of the poem, and underlined by him:

Das Gesetz dieses Gesanges ist, dass die zwei ersten Partien der Form (nach) durch Progress und Regress entgegengesetzt, aber dem Stoff nach gleich, die zwei folgenden der Form nach gleich, dem Stoff nach entgegengesetzt sind, die letzte aber mit durchgängiger Metapher alles ausgleicht. (Vol. iv, p. 354.)

The principle of construction on which the poem is based, as are many others, is clearly indicated by Hölderlin in this note,³ and reference is also made to the use of symbols. *Mit durchgängiger Metapher* is a phrase that recalls his earlier pronouncements on the subject.⁴

In 'Der Rhein' we have one of the most complete examples of Hölderlin's use of symbolism. The poem contains two symbols, the river and night. The river,

¹ It is necessary to make this point in view of Guardini's fanciful interpretation.

² Cf. such vivid and moving lines as the following:

Gegen das Meer zischt
Der Knall der Jagd. (Vol. vi, p. 13.)

... bald aber wird, wie ein Hund, umgehen
In der Hitze (?) meine Stimme auf den Gassen
der Garten. (Ibid. p. 16.)

Wie Efeu nämlich hängt
Astlos der Regen herunter. (Ibid. p. 19.)

Das Angenehme dieser Welt hab' ich genossen
Der Jugend Freuden sind wie lang! wie lang!
verflossen.

April und Mai und Junius sind ferne,
Ich bin nichts mehr, ich lebe nicht mehr gerne.
(Ibid. p. 38.)

Not all the poems printed in Hellingrath's edition, Vol. vi, seem to me to be products of Hölderlin's madness or his declining years. Parts of such poems as 'In lieblicher Bläue...' (p. 24) and 'Wenn aus dem Himmel...' (p. 33) testify to so much keenness of observation and ability to record both the objects observed and the

thoughts aroused by them, and they contain so much that is characteristic of Hölderlin at the height of his poetic power, that they deserve to be included in a selection of his best verse. I am, however, aware of the difficulty of assigning these poems, in the form in which they are printed, to Hölderlin himself (cf. the notes in Vol. vi, pp. 490 and 493). I also realize the confused nature of Hölderlin's thought and language in these poems, and it almost seems a parody of his former beliefs when Hölderlin writes:

Doch das ist auch ein Leiden, wenn
Mit Sommerflecken ist bedeckt ein Mensch,
Mit manchen Flecken ganz überdeckt zu sein!
Das
Tut die schöne Sonne: nämlich
Die zieht alles auf.

Such passages, of course, testify to the beginning of Hölderlin's madness, but they also show how deep-rooted are the views which he expressed in his mature poetry.

³ The 'triadic' structure of his poems. On this point cf. particularly R. Peacock, *Hölderlin*, and K. Vietor, *Die Lyrik Hölderlins*, 1921.

⁴ Cf. *Mod. Lang. Rev.* xxxviii, p. 232.

characteristically for Hölderlin a real river, the well-known geographical origin and course of which are of great significance, is the 'thread' running through the whole of the first part of the poem, while the symbol of the night is applied in the concluding part. The unity of the work is established by the constant reference to its main theme, its central thought, which is the conduct of life in the face of the powers of Fate and the Gods. To elucidate this thought and to understand the symbolism, it is necessary to mention one idea not hitherto found in Hölderlin's poetry.

This idea is most clearly formulated in the notes which Hölderlin added to his translation of Sophocles' *Antigone*. Referring to the possible rendering of the name 'Zeus' he says:

Im Bestimmteren oder Unbestimmteren muss wohl Zeus gesagt werden. Im *Ernste* lieber: Vater der Zeit oder: Vater der Erde, weil sein Charakter ist, der ewigen Tendenz entgegen, *das Streben aus dieser Welt in die andre zu kehren zu einem Streben aus einer andern Welt in diese* (Vol. v, p. 256) and later: *Das griechisch-tragische Wort ist tödlich faktisch*, weil der Leib, den es ergreift, wirklich tötet. Für uns, da wir unter dem eigentlicheren Zeus stehen, der nicht nur zwischen dieser Erde und der wilden Welt der Toten *inne hält*, sondern den ewig menschenfeindlichen Naturgang, auf seinem Wege in die andre Welt, *entschiedener zur Erde zwinget*, und da dies die wesentlichen und vaterländischen Vorstellungen gross ändert, und unsere Dichtkunst vaterländisch sein muss, so dass ihre Stoffe nach unserer Weltansicht gewählt sind, und ihre Vorstellungen vaterländisch, verändern sich die griechischen Vorstellungen in sofern, als ihre Haupttendenz ist, sich fassen zu können, weil darin ihre Schwäche lag, da hingegen die Haupttendenz in den Vorstellungsarten unserer Zeit ist, etwas treffen zu können, Geschick zu haben, da das Schicksallose... unsere Schwäche ist (ibid. p. 257).

In these dark and pregnant sentences contrasting the mind and the mythology of the Greeks with those of the Moderns, one idea stands out: Hölderlin believes that the main tendency in modern life is the desire to leave this world for another, whereas it is characteristic of the Greeks to contain themselves in this world. Putting it in another way, Hölderlin says that the Greeks were ruled by a Fate which enabled them to hold their own in this world, whereas the Moderns, whose lives are devoid of this containing force, strive to exceed the limits of earthly existence.¹ The purpose of the divine Zeus, the ruling God, the Father of Time, must therefore be the deflection of this striving towards the world, while in Greek times it was his aim to lead men into the other world. In 'Der Rhein' the river is presented as a symbol of the modern striving.

Hölderlin distinguishes two types: the heroes of noble birth who blindly obey the will of the Gods, and the men who revolt and assert their own will and so are punished by the Gods. The Rhine is a symbol of the first type. Its course therefore symbolizes both aspiration and submission, both the striving of modern man and his obedience to the will of the Father.

The son of Zeus and Gea, a demi-god, the river tumultuously demands its freedom from its parents and desires to run a course towards Asia.² But the God, knowing that the Rhine is in danger of early destruction if it is not curbed, places an obstacle in its way (the holy Alps) and forces it to pass through the cauldron of hard experience.³ Thus relinquishing its youthful aspiration to flow into the

¹ It is not difficult to guess that Hölderlin is thinking of the other-worldliness introduced into the modern way of thinking by Christianity. Cf. the kindred thoughts expressed by him in his letter to C. Böhlendorf (Vol. v, p. 319).

² A reference to the easterly course of the Rhine near its origin.

³ The rapids at Schaffhausen?

distant lands of the East, and accepting the decree of the God, the Rhine fulfils its destiny:

Und schön ist's, wie er drauf,
Nachdem er die Berge verlassen,
Stillwandelnd sich im deutschen Lande
Begnüget und das Sehnen stillt
Im guten Geschäfte, wenn er das Land baut,
Der Vater Rhein, und liebe Kinder nährt
In Städten, die er gegründet.

This is the content of the first six stanzas of the poem. We notice that the symbol of the river is used by Hölderlin to indicate not a course towards the ocean, towards fulfilment in eternity, but a course through the countryside, towards fulfilment in life.

In the seventh stanza of the poem Hölderlin turns to the contrasting type, to those who, forgetful of their divine origin, endeavour to become the equal of the Gods. They are the arrogant, who

Die sterblichen Pfade verachtend
Verwegenes erwählt
Und den Göttern gleich zu werden getrachtet.

The Gods reject such arrogance. They demand that men remain what they are and exercise the love which they themselves cannot feel:

Denn weil
Die Seligsten nichts fühlen von selbst,
Muss wohl, wenn solches zu sagen
Erlaubt ist, in der Götter Namen
Teilnehmend fühlen ein Anderer,
Den brauchen sie.

Arrogance they punish with destruction: the fanatic (*Schwärmer*) who aspires to be one of the Gods will wreck his own home and bury in its ruins his own father and his own child; his traces will be wiped out from this earth. We must learn to suffer the inequality of men and Gods (*Ungleiches dulden*).

In the eighth stanza Hölderlin then praises those who, like the Rhine, content themselves and find peace in the limited sphere assigned to them:

Drum wohl ihm, welcher fand
Ein wohlbeschiedenes Schicksal,
Wo noch der Wanderungen
Und süß der Leiden Erinnerung
Aufrauscht am sichern Gestade,
Dass da und dorthin gern
Er sehn mag bis an die Grenzen,
Die bei der Geburt ihm Gott
Zum Aufenthalte gezeichnet.

The second part of the poem ends here. A new train of thought begins, as indicated by the lines:

Halbgötter denk' ich jetzt
Und kennen muss ich die Teuern,
Weil oft ihr Leben so
Die sehnende Brust mir beweget.

In the difficult stanzas that follow,¹ Hölderlin seems to be thinking of the poets and thinkers whose function it is to announce the coming of the Gods to an age that has none. Rousseau is one of these bringers of the message, a view that is confirmed by the poem 'Rousseau' (Vol. iv, p. 134), particularly the lines:

Vernommen hast du sie, verstanden die Sprache der Fremdlinge,
Gedeutet ihre Seele! Dem Sehnen war
Der Wink genug, und Winke sind
Von Alters her die Sprache der Götter.
Und wunderbar, als hätte von Anbeginn
Des Menschen Geist das Werden und Wirken all,
Die alte Weise des Lebens schon erfahren,
Kennt er im ersten Zeichen Vollendetes schon,
Und fliegt, der kühne Geist, wie Adler den
Gewittern, weissagend seinen
Kommenden Göttern voraus.—

The eagle is a symbol for those who announce the coming of the Gods, here revealed in a thunderstorm. Hölderlin made the belief that the God appears to men in thunder and lightning his own, and he uses it symbolically, to indicate the upheavals which precede and accompany the appearance of the God. The lightning also signifies for him the fire which is kindled in the souls of poets and prophets, the heralds of the God:

Und daher trinken himmlisches Feuer jetzt
Die Erdensöhne ohne Gefahr.
Doch uns gebührt es, unter Gottes Gewittern,
Ihr Dichter! mit entblösstem Haupte zu stehen,
Des Vaters Strahl, ihn selbst, mit eigner Hand
Zu fassen und dem Volk ins Lied
Gehüllt die himmlische Gabe zu reichen....

('Wie wenn am Feiertage...', Vol. iv, p. 152; cf. 'Aus dem Motivkreis der Titanen', *ibid.* p. 215, esp. p. 217.)

The image of the thunderstorm is not used by Hölderlin in 'Der Rhein' to indicate the mission of poets in an age of the coming Gods, although he does refer to the suffering which their mission entails:

Drum überraschet es auch
Und schreckt den sterblichen Mann,
Wenn er den Himmel, den
Er mit den liebenden Armen
Sich auf die Schultern gehäuft,
Und die Last der Freude bedenket....

Instead he uses the image of twilight to indicate the descent of the Gods. Throughout Hölderlin's poetic work the significance of evening twilight and sunset is clearly expressed. The word *dämmern* is frequently applied by him and many associations are attached to it.² Sunset is the subject of the poem 'Dem Sonnengott' (Vol. III,

¹ The syntactical constructions are particularly involved in stanza 10. *Sicherer Sinn* goes with *reden*, so that *sicherer Sinn zu reden* and *süsse Gabe zu hören* are parallel phrases. *Sie* in line 12 refers to the following words *die Sprache*. *Die Achtungslosen* is in apposition to *die entweichenden Knechte*. The phrase *wie nenn ich den Fremden* refers back to the line: *Wem aber, wie, Rousseau, dir*. In stanza 12 the predicate of *der die Berge gebaut...* is *ruht*. In apposition to this subject

is *der Bildner* and therefore also *der Tag*, their predicate being *sich neiget*. *Zur heutigen Erde* is in apposition to *zu der Schülerin*.

² Cf. 'An den Äther' (Vol. II, p. 25):
Aber indes ich hinauf in die dämmernde Ferne
mich sehne...
Kommst du säuselnd herab von des Fruchtbaums
blühenden Wipfeln,
Vater Äther!

p. 50), one of the most beautiful short compositions of Hölderlin's second period. In this poem the departure of the Sungod is beheld with rapture and regret and nightfall is invested with a more than commonplace meaning in the lines:

Doch fern ist er, zu frommen Völkern,
Die ihn noch ehren, hinweggegangen.
Dich lieb ich, Erde! trauerst du doch mit mir!
Und unsre Trauer wandelt wie Kinderschmerz
In Schlummer sich....

The meaning, however, is not of the same order as that expressed in the second half of 'Der Rhein'. The descent of the sun does not possess symbolic meaning in the earlier poem, as it does in the later one. In the 11th and 12th stanzas of 'Der Rhein' Hölderlin celebrates the evening as the marriage of men and Gods:

Dann feiern das Brautfest Menschen und Götter
Es feiern die Lebenden all,
Und ausgeglichen
Ist eine Weile das Schicksal.

Having revealed the relationship that exists between men and Gods in the preceding stanzas of the poem, having praised the divinely guided and the divinely inspired, and condemned the sacrilegious, Hölderlin now proclaims their union and the peace that is brought to the homeless, the warriors, the lovers, and even to those who have remained unreconciled.

This is the meaning which Hölderlin gives to the twilight of evening. He sees the sun drawing nearer to the earth in its descent and the moment of its lingering before nightfall is for him the moment when human life is hallowed by the divine presence. But the light must fade and human life must end in death:

Doch einigen eilt
Dies schnell vorüber, andere
Behalten es länger.
Die ewigen Götter sind
Voll Lebens allzeit.

In this 12th stanza the difference between men and the Gods is emphasized once more. Men may live for a longer or a shorter time, the Gods live for ever. There are men who know this, whose minds are not clouded by their realization of the transience of human life:

bis in den Tod
Kann aber ein Mensch auch
Im Gedächtnis doch das Beste behalten,¹
Und dann erlebt er das Höchste.
Nur hat ein jeder sein Mass.
Denn schwer ist zu tragen
Das Unglück, aber schwerer das Glück.

Socrates is invoked as one of these, and his bearing at the Banquet becomes a symbol of the proper conduct of life:

Ein Weiser aber vermocht es
Vom Mittag bis in die Mitternacht
Und bis der Morgen erglänzte
Beim Gastmahl helle zu bleiben.

The poem ends with an invocation to Hölderlin's friend Sinclair who also knows the greatness of the God, even when the confusion of night rules once more.

¹ The function of memory in Hölderlin appears to be similar to that explained by Rilke in the Ninth Duino Elegy.

The analysis of 'Der Rhein' has shown that the use of symbols has become for Hölderlin a means of giving poetic expression and poetic unity to a complicated train of thought. The symbols have gained in depth of meaning. They now embrace several spheres of life. A new feature of Hölderlin's use of symbols in his mature period is the extension of their reference into more than one dimension.

This feature is apparent in two other poems belonging to the period 1800-1804, 'Ganymed' and 'Chiron' (Vol. iv, pp. 69 and 65). The manner in which the extension of meaning takes place is well illustrated in these poems, since they are second versions of earlier poems, 'Der gefesselte Strom' and 'Der blinde Sänger' respectively (Vol. iv, pp. 56 and 57), in which the symbolism is not as elaborate as it is in the later poems.

'Der gefesselte Strom' is at first reading merely a poem on the awakening of an ice-bound river in the spring. The river is again a being of divine origin, and the God-father sends the breezes of spring to rouse it from its sleep. But it is a poem that might equally well, in each of its aspects, apply to a hero or a poet who is roused to his divine mission by a message from God. If this is the case, the symbolism is not emphasized, and indeed there are many examples of symbolist poetry in which the poet gives no hint that anything more than a literal interpretation is intended. It is a subtle form of symbolism which leaves to the reader the discovery of more than a surface meaning in the work. The occurrence of poems of this kind in Hölderlin's later poetry marks another new feature in his use of symbols. The symbol has lost all traces of being an illustration of qualities found elsewhere or demanded in another instance. It assumes greater importance as an independent reality, and only as a whole does it have a meaning for another reality. Not merely aspects of life, but its very essences are embraced in this use of symbols.

While this remains true for 'Ganymed', the second version of 'Der gefesselte Strom', a further complication is added to the subject-matter of this poem. Besides containing new and more vivid formulations (*liegst in Unmut, schief for gehüllt in dich Und träumst; der Linkische for der Zauderer*), the later poem as a whole is now addressed to Ganymed rather than the stream and yet retains the imagery of the awakening river. The meaning of the poem is thus radically changed and particularly the end introduces a novel thought with the lines:

Der ist aber ferne; nicht mehr dabei.
Irr ging er nun; denn allzugut sind
Genien; himmlisch Gespräch ist sein nun.

The earlier poem had indicated a willing, if at first rather slow acceptance by the river of the divine decree, which seems to be modified in the later poem. In the place of external constraining circumstances obstructing, without success, the river's course into the arms of the Father, we have in 'Ganymed' an inward sluggishness and an awkwardness of manner impeding, if only temporarily, the youth's progress.

The reason for such an alteration would be difficult to find, unless it can be assumed that a further meaning again attaches to the revised poem, that Hölderlin's discomfiture as a poet is the profounder source of the work. That this assumption may not be unjustifiable will be seen from a discussion of the next pair of poems and some others linked with them chronologically and thematically.

There is the same revision of a train of thought by reference to a well-known legend, in 'Chiron', the second version of 'Der blinde Sänger'. Just as 'Ganymed' is a transposition into legendary form of 'Der gefesselte Strom', so in 'Chiron' the earlier poem is re-written around a legend. In 'Der blinde Sänger' the poet yearns

for a spiritual recovery of the faculty which he has lost. This is the meaning of the lines:

Tag! Tag! Du über stürzenden Wolken! sei
Willkommen mir! es blühet mein Auge dir.
O Jugendlicht! o Glück! das alte
Wieder! doch geistiger rinnst du nieder
Du goldener Quell aus heiligem Kelch!

In the later poem this yearning is restated as the longing, without the recovery, of the Centaur Chiron whom Apollo befriended and who was accidentally and incurably wounded by Hercules. The difference between the two versions is again significant. Contentment and recovery have given way to a feeling of resentment and a sense of injustice. Hope followed by fulfilment becomes hope unavailing:

Den Retter hör' ich dann in der Nacht, ich hör'
Ihn tötend, den Befreier....
Das aber ist der Stachel des Gottes; nie
Kann einer lieben göttliches Unrecht sonst.

It is difficult to escape the impression that in 'Ganymed' and 'Chiron' Hölderlin's deep-rooted dissatisfaction with his own fate, and with the powers that imposed it upon him, makes itself felt. Sluggishness, ill-humour, disease, blindness—such are the disabilities, one senses, from which Hölderlin himself suffers, the effects of which he expresses symbolically in different ways in the poems discussed above. In the case of Chiron the Gods themselves have caused the affliction, for Hercules is called *der Halbgott, Zeus Knecht*.¹ We are reminded of Hölderlin's words in a letter dated 2 December 1802:

Und wie man Helden nachspricht, kann ich wohl sagen, dass mich Apollo geschlagen—nor should we forget the importance that Hercules has for him as the faithful servant of the God and the half-brother of Christ.

There are, indeed, many passages in Hölderlin's poems belonging to this period which express the same feeling:

Zu mächtig ach! ihr himmlischen Höhen zieht
Ihr mich empor; bei Stürmen, am heitern Tag
Fühl ich verzehrend euch im Busen
Wechseln, ihr wandelnden Götterkräfte.

'Mein Eigentum' (Vol. iv, p. 12).

Denn nie, sterblichen Meistern gleich,
Habt ihr Himmlischen, ihr Alleserhaltenden,
Dass ich wüsste, mit Vorsicht
Mich des ebenen Pfads geführt.

'Lebenslauf' (Vol. iv, p. 22).

It is this thought of having been stricken by the Gods that is felt perhaps most poignantly in the last lines of the inimitable 'Hälfte des Lebens' and in the obscure lines of 'Reif sind, in Feuer getaucht...':

Und vieles
Wie auf Schultern eine
Last von Scheitern ist
Zu behalten. Aber böse sind
Die Pfade. Nämlich unrecht,
Wie Rosse, gehn die gefangenen
Element' und alten
Gesetze der Erd.

(Vol. iv, p. 71.)

¹ Cf. Montgomery's quotation of a passage from Conz's *Abhandlungen* (1794), in which Hercules is seen as an obedient servant of Jupiter: 'Aus Gehorsam gegen Gott durchzog er

die Welt und vertilgte Unrecht und Gesetzlosigkeit von der Erde' (*Friedrich Hölderlin and the German Neo-Hellenic Movement*, 1923, p. 216).

In this latter poem, the dark and desperate meaning of which has been explained for the first time by Bertaux (loc. cit. p. 365), Hölderlin's final resolution to endure his lot and to remain faithful to his Gods even while he is chastised by them, his resignation and acceptance, are also seen, as they are seen in the final stanza of 'Lebenslauf':

Und immer
 Ins Ungebundene gehet eine Sehnsucht. Vieles aber ist
 Zu behalten. Und Not die Treue.
 Vorwärts aber und rückwärts wollen wir
 Nicht sehn. Uns wiegen lassen, wie
 Auf schwankem Kahne der See. (Vol. iv, p. 71.)

Alles prüfe der Mensch, sagen die Himmlischen,
 Dass er, kräftig genährt, danken für Alles lern',
 Und verstehe die Freiheit,
 Aufzubrechen, wohin er will. (Vol. iv, p. 22.)

This resolve, which we have met in 'Der Rhein', is the leading thought in the two versions of 'Dichtermut' and their third version 'Blödigkeit' (Vol. iv, pp. 39, 41, 68), as well as in the two versions of 'Ermunterung' (Vol. iv, pp. 43, 45):

Was geschiehet, es sei alles gesegnet dir,
 Sei zur Freude gewandt! oder was könnte dich
 Denn beleidigen, Herz, was
 Da begegnen, wohin du sollst. (Vol. iv, pp. 39, 41.)

In the second version of 'Dichtermut' the setting of the sun, the descent of the God into the realms of darkness, inspires in the poet this resolution:

Ihn erwartet, auch ihn nimmt, wo die Stunde kommt,
 Seine purpurne Flut; sieh! und das edle Licht
 Gehet, kundig des Wandels,
 Gleichgesinnet hinab den Pfad.
 So vergehe denn auch, wenn es die Zeit einst ist
 Und dem Geiste sein Recht nirgend gebricht, so sterb'
 Einst im Ernste des Lebens
 Unsre Freude, doch schönen Tod! (Vol. iv, pp. 41-2.)

If the image is lost in the third version ('Blödigkeit'), the resolution persists and it is linked with an affirmation of the poet's mission:

Gut auch sind und geschickt einem zu etwas wir,
 Wenn wir kommen, mit Kunst, und von den Himmlischen
 Einen bringen. Doch selber
 Bringen schickliche Hände wir. (Vol. iv, p. 68.)

The belief is also expressed in 'Ermunterung', and with greater emphasis in the second version of the poem:

O Hoffnung! bald, bald singen die Haine nicht
 Des Lebens Lob allein, denn es ist die Zeit,
 Dass aus der Menschen Munde sie, die
 Schönere Seele, sich neuverkündet....
 Und Er, der sprachlos waltet und unbekannt
 Zukünftiges bereitet, der Gott, der Geist
 Im Menschenwort, am schönen Tage
 Kommenden Jahren, wie einst, sich ausspricht. (Vol. iv, pp. 45-6.)

Hölderlin's trust at this stage of his life is inspired by the hope that the era of night will not continue indefinitely, but that the Gods will return, are indeed returning to the world from which they had departed, and it is the mission

of the poets to proclaim their coming. This belief allows him to affirm not only the sorrows of his own life, but life in the age and country in which he was born. It is an affirmation that is for Hölderlin possible only with the certainty of the return of the Gods. This is his chiasm, a belief, however, not in the millennium as a final stage in history, but as an eternal process, an *ewige Wiederkehr* in something like Nietzsche's sense of the word.

Fundamental to Hölderlin's ultimate faith is the thought that the same God or Gods depart from and return to the world when the time is ripe, in an ever recurrent cycle. The Gods are there, eternal and changeless, and now this one, now that, as the Father determines, is sent to one of the lands on earth. Heracles and Dionysos were sent to Greece, Christ to Palestine, and now, Hölderlin believes, a God is to be sent to Germany. Christ and Dionysos and Heracles are brothers and the new God is their brother too. These are the thoughts which Hölderlin expresses in 'Brot und Wein' and 'Patmos', as well as in other poems belonging to this period:

Und das Schweigen im Volk, ist es die Feier schon
Vor dem Feste? die Furcht, welche den Gott ansagt?

'An die Deutschen' (Vol. iv, p. 132).

Drum sandten sie den Boten, der, sie schnell erkennend,
Denkt lächelnd so: Dich, unzerbrechliche, muss
Ein ander Wort erpfunden und ruft es laut,
Der Jugendliche, nach Germania schauend:
'Du bist es, auserwählt
Alliebend und ein schweres Glück
Bist du zu tragen stark geworden.' 'Germanien' (V

Bist du zu tragen stark geworden.' 'Germanien' (Vol. iv, p. 183).

The latter poem, 'Germanien', contains much of the thought explained above. The second stanza gives a complete picture of the departure of the Gods, and in the third stanza we have the eagle employed as the messenger of the Gods, as the angel of Annunciation.

In thus affirming both Christianity and Germany, in a manner he had hitherto not been able to do, Hölderlin finally resolves a discord in his own life. It is no longer necessary for him to seek his spiritual home in Greece or in the lands of the East. Just as the Rhine, bent with mighty longing towards Asia, is directed to run through German lands, there to produce beauty and happiness, so Hölderlin alters the course of his genius westward to the country of his birth. The Rhine, in addition to being a symbol of heroic life, has become for Hölderlin a symbol of his own life, and with this meaning too he applies the river-symbol in other poems belonging to the years 1800-1804. With greater wisdom, Hölderlin wishes to remain in his narrower homeland Swabia, whilst the Rhine, impetuously seeking her favours, is repulsed by her and disappears:

Unfreundlich ist, und schwer zu gewinnen,
Die Verslossene, der ich entkommen, die Mutter.
Von ihren Söhnen einer, der Rhein,
Mit Gewalt wollt er ans Herz ihr stürzen und schwand,
Der Zurückgestossene, niemand weiss, wohin in die Ferne.
Doch nicht so wünscht' ich gegangen zu sein
Von ihr und nur, euch einzuladen
Bin ich zu euch, ihr Grazien Griechenlands,
Ihr Himmelstöchter, gegangen,
Dass, wenn die Reise zu weit nicht ist,
Zu uns ihr kommet, ihr Holden!

'Die Wanderung' (Vol. iv, p. 170).

The poem of which this passage is the climax, 'Die Wanderung', can be contrasted with the earlier poems 'Der Main' and 'Der Neckar' (Vol. III, pp. 54 and 59).

Whereas in the latter Hölderlin sought his true home among the isles of Greece, but desired to carry with him the image of his beloved German rivers, in 'Die Wanderung' the reverse is the case. He may visit the isles of Hellas, even has a prerogative to do so, since poets are like the swallows seeking eternal spring, and since according to legend his German forefathers once settled on the Black Sea, so that his visit is in a sense a home-coming too. But his acknowledged home is now Swabia, and he has merely undertaken his journey to invite the Graces of Greece to return with him to Germany. Symbolically, then, this journey expresses Hölderlin's will to affirm life in his native land. Yet he also knows that the debt to Greece is imperishable, that the Germans are still the *Barbaren von alters her* Hyperion saw:

Wenn milder atmen die Lüfte,
Und liebende Pfeile der Morgen
Uns Allzuredulidigen schickt,

Dann werden wir sagen, wie kommt,
Ihr Charitinnen, zu Wilden?

(Vol. iv, pp. 170-1.)

In 'Der Archipelagus', which is justly acclaimed Hölderlin's major achievement in elegiac poetry, the celebration of the Greek landscape, Greek life and Greek heroism is accompanied by a condemnation of the barbarousness of German life, although the conviction prevails that in Germany the modern re-birth, the divine restoration will take place:

Aber weh! es wandelt in Nacht, es wohnt, wie im Orkus,
Ohne Göttliches unser Geschlecht. Ans eigene Treiben
Sind sie geschmiedet allein, und sich in der tosenden Werkstatt
Höret jeglicher nur und viel arbeiten die Wilden
Mit gewaltigem Arm, rastlos, doch immer und immer
Unfruchtbar, wie die Furien, bleibt die Mühe der Armen.
Bis, erwacht vom ängstigen Traum, die Seele den Menschen
Aufgeht, jugendlich froh, und der Liebe segnender Othem
Wieder, wie vormals oft, bei Hellas blühenden Kindern,
Wehet in neuer Zeit und über freierer Stirne
Uns der Geist der Natur, der fernherwandelnde, wieder
Stillewährend der Gott in goldenen Wolken erscheint.

(Vol. iv, p. 99.)

The German land endowed by Nature, not the race of Germans, induces Hölderlin's *vaterländische Umkehr* (Vol. v, p. 259). In everything he says, even at this stage, it is the landscape of Germany rather than its people that elicits his praise:

Die heimatliche Natur ergreift mich um so mächtiger, je mehr ich sie studiere. Das Gewitter, nicht bloss in seiner höchsten Erscheinung, sondern in eben dieser Ansicht, als Macht und als Gestalt, in den übrigen Formen des Himmels, das Licht in seinem Wirken, nationell und als Prinzip und Schicksalsweise bildend, dass uns etwas heilig ist, sein Gang im Kommen und Gehen, das Charakteristische der Wälder und das Zusammentreffen in einer Gegend von verschiedenen Charakteren der Natur... ist jetzt meine Freude. (Letter dated 2 December 1802, Vol. v, p. 324.)

When Hölderlin praises a nation, it is never the German. There is no counterpart in his work to the eulogy of the Greeks in 'Hyperion' and 'Der Archipelagus', even when he expressed his trust in the German 'mission'.

This attitude, so frequently overlooked by German critics, so little emphasized by others, must be kept in mind if Hölderlin's 'patriotism' is to be understood for what it was, a belief in a Germany that has never existed, that did not exist when Hölderlin proclaimed his faith, a Germany not of his experience but of his aspiration. It is a view enforced rather than disproved by the poems 'Gesang der Deutschen' and 'An die Deutschen' (Vol. iv, pp. 129 and 132). In the former is it not the land

of the Germans, its rivers and towns, that Hölderlin proclaims, and are the German women not created by him in the image of his own Diotima whom he had called an Athenian? 'An die Deutschen' concludes with his feeling of estrangement:

Wenn die Seele dir auch über die eigne Zeit
Sich die sehnnende schwingt, trauernd verweilst du
Dann am kalten Gestade
Bei den Deinen und kennst sie nie.

(Vol. iv, p. 133.)

Believing his aspiration of the revival of life on German soil to be valid, and feeling the strong urge to write hymnic and not merely elegiac poetry, Hölderlin wrote what we may consider among his last great works, 'Brot und Wein' and 'Patmos'. It is here that his belief in himself as a poet is triumphantly vindicated. Now we can see the meaning of his dark thoughts in 'Chiron' and kindred poems, his dread of blindness and inertia. It is already made clear in 'Menons Klagen um Diotima', the moving document of Hölderlin's most painful personal loss:

Aber das Haus ist öde mir nun, und sie haben mein Auge
Mir genommen, auch mich hab' ich verloren mit ihr.
Darum irr' ich umher, und wohl, wie Schatten, so muss ich
Leben, und sinnlos dünkt lange das übrige mir.

(Vol. iv, p. 84.)

Hölderlin's deepest concern is his possible lack of faith, his own descent into the dark depths where the divine light cannot shine, his fear that his own life will become as godless as the life of his age. But Diotima herself has taught him the lesson of true devotion to the Gods, and she appears to him in his hour of distrust to re-awaken in him his old faith:

So will ich, ihr Himmlischen! denn auch danken, und endlich
Atmet aus leichter Brust wieder des Sängers Gebet.
Und wie, wenn ich mit ihr, auf sonniger Höhe mit ihr stand,
Spricht belebend ein Gott innen vom Tempel mich an.

(Vol. iv, p. 86.)

The process of doubt followed by re-affirmation is repeated on a higher plane of experience (higher because not derived from a personal loss) in 'Versöhnender, der du nimmergeglauht', the hymn of reconciliation with Christ, the summary of Hölderlin's profoundest misgivings and their resolution; for Christ is the God of reconciliation itself:

Zuvorbestimmt wars. Und es lächelt Gott
Wenn unaufhaltsam aber von seinen Bergen gehemmt
Ihm zürnend in den ehernen Ufern brausen die Ströme,
Tief wo kein Tag die begrabenen nennt.
Und o, dass immer, allerhaltender, du auch mich
So haltest und leichtentfliegende Seele mir sparest,
Drum hab ich heute das Fest, und abendlich in der Stille
Blüht rings der Geist....

(Vol. iv, p. 163.)

In this poem, which reveals again Hölderlin's use of his favourite symbols, praise is seen to be the poet's mission. A similar idea is expressed, mythologically, in a stanza which Norbert von Hellingrath has, with pardonable exaggeration, called one of the most beautiful and powerful in the German language (Vol. iv, p. 374):

Noch aber hat andre
Bei sich der Vater.
Denn über den Alpen
Weil an den Adler
Sich halten müssen, damit sie nicht
Mit eigenem Sinne zornig deuten
Die Dichter, wohnen über dem Fluge
Des Vogels, um den Thron

Des Gottes der Freude
 Und decken den Abgrund
 Ihm zu, die gelbem Feuer gleich, in reissender Zeit
 Sind über Stirnen der Männer,
 Die Prophetischen, denen möchten
 Es neiden, weil die Furcht
 Sie lieben, götterlose Schatten der Hölle.

'Aus dem Motivkreis der Titanen' (Vol. iv, p. 217).

In this passage the eagle may still symbolically represent the heralds of the coming God, but more particularly its flight denotes the highest region to which the thoughts of a poet may aspire, a region midway between the throne of God and the habitation of man. In the higher sphere, closer to the throne of God, dwell other beings, demi-gods like Hercules, the favoured of God. In times of stress they inspire fear and envy in those who dwell in godless night.¹

One is reminded of Rilke's Angels, who are so terrible to man because they dwell near to God and are the favoured of His creation. Hölderlin, like Rilke, knows that there is a region beyond which no man can penetrate to the presence of God, that man must accept his limitation and that poets should strive to overcome their discontent:

Ich will nun nimmer den Unmut in mir Meister sein lassen. Der Übermut soll aber auch sich beugen vor dem, was um uns und über uns ist. (Vol. v, p. 293; cf. p. 303.)

The doctrine of *Offenheit*, the origin of which was seen in Hölderlin's second period, is the clearest expression of his final affirmation of his life as a poet. This view, the core of the poem 'Dichterberuf' (Vol. iv, p. 145), is put most succinctly in the lines from 'Wie wenn am Feiertage':

Des gemeinsamen Geistes Gedanken sind
 Still endend in der Seele des Dichters. (Vol. iv, p. 152.)

In his last period Hölderlin becomes the poet of communal life and communal action. The idea of a community is for him inseparable from the appearance of the divine on earth, and there can be no true divine revelation without a community. In the second version of 'Stimme des Volks' (Vol. iv, p. 142) the personal application of the symbolism of the original poem is modified in order to celebrate the communal act of self-destruction of the citizens of Xanthos, in excessive obedience to the will of the Gods:

Denn selbstvergessen, allzubereit den Wunsch
 Der Götter zu erfüllen, ergreift zu gern,
 Was sterblich ist, wenn offenen Augs auf
 Eigenen Pfaden es einmal wandelt,
 Ins All zurück die kürzeste Bahn; so stürzt
 Der Strom hinab, er suchet die Ruh', es reisst,
 Es ziehet wider Willen ihn, von
 Klippe zu Klippe, den Steuerlosen
 Das wunderbare Sehnen dem Abgrund zu;
 Das Ungebundene reizet und Völker auch
 Ergreift die Todeslust und kühne
 Städte, nachdem sie versucht das Beste...

The central portion of 'Brot und Wein' (sections 4-6) describes the founding of

¹ The syntax of the stanza is again most involved. *Sie* in line 5 is in the accusative case and is qualified by the clause beginning *die gelbem Feuer gleich* in line 11. *Die Dichter* (line 7) is the subject of the clauses in lines 4-6.

Die Prophetischen (line 13) is in apposition to *sie* in line 5; *denen* (line 13) refers to *Die Prophetischen*, *Sie* (line 15) refers to *Männer* and is the subject of *neiden* and *lieben*.

religious communities and laments their passing: the coming of the Gods in Greece is depicted:

Unempfunden kommen sie erst, es streben entgegen
Ihnen die Kinder, zu hell kommet, zu blendend das Glück,

dann aber in Wahrheit
Kommen sie selbst, und gewohnt werden die Menschen des Glücks
Und des Tags und zu schau'n die Offenbaren.... (Vol. iv, p. 122.)

What follows in this poem is the coming of Christ, the last God to appear in the world, the herald of a new era when the Gods have departed and night reigns on earth until they return in the dawn of a new day. Bread and wine are the tokens that the Gods have left behind them, tokens of promise that they will return:

Darum denken wir auch dabei der Himmlischen, die sonst
Da gewesen und die kehren in richtiger Zeit.... (Vol. iv, p. 125.)

In Hölderlin's view there is no finality about the coming of Christ. Communal life in the spirit which he demands is lacking now, since the Gods no longer live among men. Only the visible presence of the Gods among men is for Hölderlin a guarantee of real fulfilment:

Aber Freund! wir kommen zu spät. Zwar leben die Götter,
Aber über dem Haupt droben in anderer Welt. (Vol. iv, p. 123.)

Yet he accepts life in this God-less era, because he can discover the traces that they have left behind and possesses the certainty of their return. The closing lines of the poem, perhaps the gentlest that Hölderlin wrote, express the peace which this wisdom brings:

Selige Weise sehns; ein Lächeln aus der gefangnen
Seele leuchtet, dem Licht tauet ihr Auge noch auf.
Sanfter träumet und schläft in Armen der Erde der Titan,
Selbst der neidische, selbst Cerberus trinkt und schläft. (Vol. iv, p. 125.)

The softness of the voiced sounds, the restfulness of the rhythmic modulations, and the calmness suggested by the imagery are all an expression of inward peace.¹

In 'Patmos' the core of the poem is again Hölderlin's lamentation of the fragmentariness and the desolation of life in a world abandoned by God:

Wenn aber stirbt alsdenn,
An dem am meisten
Die Schönheit hing, dass an der Gestalt
Ergötzend sich die Himmlischen gedeutet
Auf ihn, und wenn nicht fassen können
Einander mehr, die zusammenlebten
Im Gedächtnis, und nicht den Sand nur oder
Die Weiden es hinwegnimmt und die Tempel
Entwurzelt, wenn die Ehre
Des Halbgotts und der Seinen
Verweht und selber sein Angesicht

¹ The last section of the poem is not clear to me, despite many attempts to explain it. *Der Syrier* is usually taken to refer to Christ (cf. the phrase in 'Versöhnender, der du nimmergeglaubt...' *dort unter syrischer Palme*, Vol. v, p. 163), and Hölderlin is said to identify Christ with Bacchus. The explanation is not stringent, and one cannot escape the impression that Hölderlin, in altering the last section of the poem, is in two minds. He is trying to assert

the living power of Christ's influence in the world, despite the manifest contradiction this thought entails with section 8. Böhm may be justified in preferring the earlier version ('Der Weingott') in which this contradiction is not felt, since there is no obvious reference to another beside Bacchus (loc. cit. Vol. II, p. 475).

The whole question of Hölderlin's Christianity presents almost insuperable difficulties.

Der Höchste wendet,
 Darob, dass nirgend ein
 Unsterbliches zu sehn ist am Himmel oder
 Auf grüner Erde, was ist dies? (Vol. iv, p. 195.)

But again the lament is relieved by the recognition of a profounder truth. The ways of God are not unlike those of men. A great task cannot be accomplished without interruption nor without some loss, even as the peasant will spill some of the corn he is sifting:

Es ist der Wurf des Sämanns, wenn er fasst
 Mit der Schaufel den Weizen
 Und wirft, ihn an das Ende schwingend über die Tenne,
 Die Spreu fällt, ihm zu Füßen, aber
 Ans Ende kommet das Korn,
 Und nicht ein Schaden ist,
 Wenn Einiges verloren geht, und von der Rede
 Verhallet der lebendige Laut,
 Denn göttliches Werk auch gleicht dem unsern.
 Nicht Alles will der Höchste zumal.

In 'Brot und Wein' Hölderlin had asked the question: 'Wozu Dichter in dürrtiger Zeit?' Now, certain in his knowledge of the purposefulness of the divine will, he can reply to this question in 'Patmos':

Wenn nämlich höher gehet himmlischer
 Triumphgang, wird genennet, der Sonne gleich
 Von Starken, der frohlockende Sohn des Höchsten.
 Dann ist, wie jetzt, die Zeit des Gesangs.
 Und hier ist der Stab
 Des Gesanges, niederwinkend,
 Denn nichts ist gemein. (Vol. iv, p. 196.)

His affirmation has brought him strength to recognize the poet's mission even in the hour when the Gods are at the furthest remove from the earth, like the sun at the hour of midday. But this strength did not suffice to dispel the clouds that were rapidly gathering around him. He was seized with fits of strange violence and his mind became permanently deranged. Was his reconciliation with the times and with the country of his birth a solution of his problems in any but a provisional sense? Perhaps the necessity of this particular solution was the source of his deepest despair. We may speculate on the real meaning of Hölderlin's madness, but of its connexion with his development as a poet, although his insanity does not explain his poetry, there can hardly be a doubt. The grave words which W. B. Yeats wrote of Gérard de Nerval (*Ideas of Good and Evil*, p. 252) are singularly applicable to Hölderlin:

In an earlier time he would have been of that multitude, whose souls austerity withdrew, even more perfectly than madness could withdraw his soul, from hope and memory, from desire and regret, that they might reveal those processions of symbols that men bow to before altars, and woo with incense and offerings. But being of our time he has been... like all who are preoccupied with intellectual symbols in our time, a foreshadower of the new sacred book, of which all the arts, as somebody has said, are begging to dream, and because, as I think, they cannot overcome the slow dying of men's hearts that we call the progress of the world, and lay their hands upon men's heart-strings again, without becoming the garment of religion as in old times.

E. L. STAHL

PROBLEMS OF DIALECTOLOGY IN THE SOVIET UNION

With a short Bibliography

'It must not be forgotten that in our country an immeasurably greater number of languages are spoken than in any other country in Europe', wrote the great Russian writer, Maxim Gorky. During the twenty-six years that have elapsed since the October Revolution important successes have been achieved in developing the literary languages of all the peoples of our country, some of which were formerly unwritten. The Russian language enjoys a special place in the linguistic development of the Soviet Union and has great significance for the development of national cultures and languages: it is the language of mutual intercourse between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the reservoir from which words necessary to other languages are obtained. The development of national, general literary languages naturally caused a ferment of territorial dialects, a fact of primary interest to the student of dialect. Great changes have also taken place in the Russian language itself as a result of the general rise in the cultural level of the people, universal literacy, and the rapid development of the radio, sound films and the press; as the literary language is raised to a higher cultural level, the foundations of the territorial dialects become less firm, and a complicated and contradictory process takes place in which the dialects are levelled out and replaced by the national language.

Many Russian dialectologists who studied a given dialect ten or twelve years ago no longer recognize it to-day. Only a few old individual women of the oldest living generation can give one an idea of the local dialect which was the vernacular a short time ago. The study of the process of decay of the former territorial dialects is the most important task of modern Russian dialectology. At the same time the attention of the dialectologist is turned to those archaisms which have become fixed in speech and still remain in use, and without which work on the history of the language would be impossible.

The study of the living dialects and languages of the Soviet Union is of long standing. During the second half of the nineteenth century such outstanding linguists as Potebnya, Fortunatov and Baudouin de Courtenay pointed out the necessity of a careful study of dialect. The school founded by the Academician Fortunatov, which produced the genius Shakhmatov and a number of other important dialectologists, was of great significance. Shakhmatov stated on many occasions that the real source for building up a history of the language is to be found in the data of the living dialects and that the indications found in written records are mainly of value when compared with the facts of the living dialects. The works of the well-known Soviet linguist, N. Y. Marr, had great significance for the development of Soviet dialectology. Marr also pointed out that modern living dialects and languages often contain indications of an older stage in the development of the given language than is reflected in the written records.

One of our greatest dialectological undertakings of recent years is the commencement of a *Dialect Atlas of the Russian Language*, and a more comprehensive *Linguistic Atlas of the Soviet Union*. The latter will form part of an atlas of the world's languages which will at some future date be compiled by the joint efforts of the linguists of the whole world. The compilation of the Russian dialect Atlas involves a difficulty such as our western colleagues do not have to cope

with—the tremendous territory over which the Russian language is used and the consequent vast scope of the work. At the present moment Russian dialectology has at its disposal only the *Experimental Dialectological Map of the Russian Language in Europe with an Outline of Russian Dialectology* (1915) compiled by Durnovo, Sokolov and Ushakov. Many new facts have been accumulated during the past decades which in many cases make important corrections necessary to what was known from the map of 1915. In 1935 the compilation of a *Dialectological Atlas of the Russian Language* was begun by the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. under the direction of the Leningrad Professors Larin and Filin. By way of experiment a small territory on the upper waters of the Volga was investigated, the Lake Seliger area, and a dialect atlas of the region was compiled and printed before the war. Having gained the necessary experience and increased the number of workers by including students and members of the faculty of universities and pedagogical institutes, the group began, in 1937, compiling an atlas of Russian dialects of the extensive north-western district of the U.S.S.R., which was to be the first issue of the large atlas of the Russian language. This work was drawing to a close by the middle of 1941. In 1939 Moscow dialectologists joined in the work and under the direction of the present author started work on the compilation of an atlas of the central regions of European Russia (the Moscow, Ryazan and Tula Regions). This district was selected on account of its importance in clearing up problems in the history of the Russian language.

Taking as our starting-point the dialect as the product of cultural and historical development, we consider that its complete refutation by certain representatives of the school of linguistic geography is as false as the conception of the dialect as a complete organic system. Such facts as the non-coincidence of the boundary lines marking the extent of the territory in which certain phenomena are to be observed (isogloss), the presence of isogloss clusters in certain 'critical' areas, the irregularity of the distribution of various phenomena in their application to all words and all cases within the bounds of various dialects, all go to prove the absence of so-called phonetic laws and not the absence of dialects as such, and are merely proof of the relative nature of these conceptions, the intricate history of the dialects and their tortuous path of development. In view of all this, Soviet dialectologists, in the compilation of maps showing the area covered by certain pronunciations or forms of individual words, are supplementing this work by maps showing individual phonetic and grammatical phenomena. Such superimposed maps of phenomena and of the commoner words or categories of words affected by the phenomena help in establishing the irregularity of the application of the phenomena to various dialects and the dynamics of the development of dialects. In compiling their atlas, Soviet dialectologists have given the material collected a social as well as a territorial characteristic: the principal map is based on the language of those speaking the archaic traditional dialect, and additional maps show the extent to which the same phenomena occur in the language of the village intellectuals and the youth of the Soviet period. The superimposition of the maps shows the recent development of the dialect concerned. Great care is taken in considering the type of settlement concerned—in the main the maps are based on the data of dialects spoken in inhabited places in agricultural regions, but material drawn from workers' settlements (especially old ones) and urban dialects is also used. Another factor that is the subject of careful study is the peculiarities in genre of the language (excluding everyday and household words) on which separate maps are based, attention being given to various forms of public speech, the

language of folk-songs, folk-lore, etc. The non-coincidence of territorial boundaries to which phenomena in everyday speech and in the traditional language of folk-lore extend cannot be established without the work of the dialectologist.

Another task undertaken by Soviet dialectologists, and one that is no less important than the compilation of the atlas, is the description, in monograph form, of separate dialects. In addition to extensive descriptions, without which the compilation of the atlas would be impossible, an all-round description of an intensive nature is also of great importance: such descriptions complement one another, and it is only when they are all taken together that a study of the language as a whole is possible.

In this respect the functional description of the language is the method most widely used, which, in the field of phonetics, leads to a phonological description. The object of such a description is to present all the sound-variations within a definite system, taking as a starting-point the differential functions of the speech sounds as indicators of different meaning. A large number of sound variants is reduced to a definite number of sounds or sound series important from a functional standpoint, that is, a system of phonemes is established. Note is made of the general and the facultative, the stylistically neutral and the stylistically specialized. Attempts at this type of description have been made with Russian dialects by the present author, by Sidorov and others. Functional description presupposes in principle a complete practical mastery of the language or dialect being studied, an ideal by which the object of study is at the same time the subject, and the method of observation gradually becomes the method of self-observation. Such an exhaustive description of a dialect is not only important from the standpoint of problems connected with general linguistics but also from the standpoint of the history of the language concerned, on account of the fact that it frequently enables questions of the origin and history of individual phenomena or dialects to be treated in a new way.

The third task undertaken by Soviet dialectologists is the compilation of a many-volumed regional (dialect) dictionary of the Russian language which is to contain all the wealth of language in the Russian dialects. This dictionary would be a natural complement to two other dictionaries being compiled by the Academy of Sciences, *A Dictionary of the Russian Literary Language* and *A Dictionary of Old Russian*. Russian dialectology has at its disposal a number of dictionaries covering various dialects; there are general provincial dictionaries which are now obsolete, and there is a large quantity of dialectical material included in V. I. Dal's famous *Dictionary of the Russian Language*, but there is no single dictionary which contains all the material that has been accumulated (published material and that contained in manuscripts in the archives of the Academy of Sciences and other organizations). A group of research workers of the Academy of Sciences working under the direction of the Academicians Obnorsky and Shcherba have undertaken this task. In the Union and Autonomous Republics of the Soviet Union work on the compilation of regional dictionaries of the languages of the peoples of the Soviet Union is also being done.

Dialectological work in the Soviet Union is concentrated mainly in the institutes of the Academy of Sciences and in the Departments of Linguistics in the universities and pedagogical institutes. The work of the Moscow Dialectological Commission, organized on the initiative of Shakhmatov at the Section of the Russian Language and Literature of the Academy of Sciences in 1903 and working until 1931, was of great importance in the development of dialectology in Russia.

The Chairman of the Commission was Korsh, and the Vice-Chairman, Ushakov. On the former's death in 1915, Ushakov, who took over the Chairmanship, was the real organizer of all the commission's work and the editor of the twelve issues of the Transactions, including the *Experimental Dialectological Map of the Russian Language in Europe*. Many Soviet dialectologists came from amongst the members of the commission. Considerable work was also done in Leningrad under the direct guidance of Shakhmatov. The older generation of Soviet dialectologists includes Ushakov, Selishchev (author of the well-known *Dialectological Notes on Siberia*), Obnorsky, Chernyshev, Karinsky (author of *Notes on the Language of the Russian Peasants*), Golanov, Rastorguyev, Bubrikh, Zelenin, and Zhirmunsky (author of *National Language and Social Dialects*, in which the problem in general is examined, mainly on the material of West-European languages). The younger generation of dialectologists includes Larin, Filin (author of *Research into the Vocabulary of Russian Dialects*), Grinkov, Avanesov, Sidorov, Kuznetsov, Komshilov *et alii*.

In the Academy of Sciences, dialectological work is concentrated in the main in the Marr Institute of Language and Thought in Leningrad and in the Institute of Language and Writing of the Peoples of the U.S.S.R. in Moscow. In 1940 a Permanent Dialectological Commission of the Department of Literature and Language of the Academy of Sciences was organized under the Academician Shcherba for the purpose of co-ordinating and organizing all dialectological work in the country, and with the object of giving direction to such huge collective undertakings as the compilation of a linguistic atlas of the U.S.S.R. or the Regional Dictionary of the Russian Language, and also to keep in touch with corresponding bodies abroad.

The Ukrainian and Belorussian Academies of Sciences and similar organizations in the other Union and Autonomous Republics have also done considerable work on these lines.

At present, when a bitter struggle is being waged against the German invaders, some of the tasks begun have been diverted into other channels, others have been laid aside unprinted, but the main work, the examination of culled materials and the collection of new material, has never ceased for one moment.

Russian linguists fully realize that in this stupendous struggle the Russian language and the languages of other peoples of the U.S.S.R. are threatened. They therefore consider that every place of work supporting our culture, in all the many variations of its national form, is part of our arsenal of resources in the struggle.

БИБЛИОГРАФИЯ

Из литературы по русской диалектологии

Литература по русской диалектологии весьма обширна. Ниже указываются немногие работы, из числа более важных по материалу или по методу.

Звездочкой помечены авторы, упомянутые в тексте.

I. Общие пособия

*Соболевский, А. И. Очерк русской диалектологии. Живая старина, 1892, I-IV.

*Соболевский, А. И. Опыт русской диалектологии. 1897 г.

*Дурново, Н. Н., Соколов, Н. Н. и Ушаков, Д. Н. Опыт диалектологической карты русского языка в Европе с приложением очерка русской диалектологии. Москва, 1915.

Карский, Е. Ф. Русская диалектология. Ленинград, 1924.

Дурново, Н. Н. Введение в историю русского языка. Часть 1. Источники.

1. Письменные памятники. 2. Нынешние русские диалекты. В чпо, 1927.

(Приложены 4 диалектологические карты русского, украинского и белорусского языков.)

Еремин, С. и Фалев, И. Русская диалектология. 1928.

Голанов, И. Г. Русская диалектология. Издание 2-го Моск. Госуд. Университета, 1929.

*Жирмунский, В. М. Национальный язык и социальные диалекты. Ленинград, 1936.

II. Исследования и описания говоров

Будде, Е. Ф. К диалектологии великорусских наречий. Исследование особенностей рязанского говора. Варшава, 1892.

Будде, Е. Ф. К истории великорусских говоров. Опыт историкосравнительного исследования народного говора в Касимовском уезде Рязанской губернии. Казань, 1896.

Брок, О. Описание одного говора из юго-западной части Тетемского уезда. Сборник отделения русского языка и словесности Акад. Наук, Т. lxxiii, 1907.

Брок, О. Говоры к западу от Мосальска (с картой). Петроград, 1916.

Васильев, Л. Л. Гласные в слове под ударением в момент возникновения аканья в обоянском говоре. Известия отделения русского языка и словесности Акад. Наук, Т. ix, кн. 1, 1904.

Васильев, Л. Л. О значении каморы в некоторых древнерусских памятниках XVI—XVII веков. К вопросу о произношении звука о в великорусском наречии. Ленинград, 1929.

Дурново, Н. Н. Описание говора деревни Парфенок Рузского уезда Московской губернии. Варшава, 1903.

Дурново, Н. Н. Диалектологические разыскания в области великорусских говоров. Часть 1. Южно-великорусское наречие. Выпуск I, Москва, 1917. Выпуск II, 1918.

*Зеленин, Д. Е. Великорусские говоры с неорганическим и непреходным смягчением заднеязычных согласных. С.-Петербург, 1913.

*Каринский, Н. М. Очерки языка русских крестьян. Москва-Ленинград, 1936.

*Потебня, А. А. Два исследования о звуках русского языка. Воронеж, 1866.

*Потебня, А. А. К истории звуков русского языка. Т. I, Воронеж, 1876; Т. II, Варшава, 1880.

*Селищев, А. М. Диалектологический очерк Сибири. Иркутск, 1921.

*Селищев, А. М. Статьи по русской диалектологии в журнале. Т. IV, кн. 1—2; Т. VI, кн. 2—3; Т. X, кн. 4 и др.

*Шахматов, А. А. Исследования в области русской фонетики. Варшава, 1893.

*Шахматов, А. А. К вопросу об образовании русских наречий. Русский филологический вестник, Т. xxxii, 1894.

*Шахматов, А. А. К вопросу об образовании русских наречий и русских народностей. Журнал Министерства народного просвещения, 1899, No. 4.

*Шахматов, А. А. Звуковые особенности Ельнинских и Мосальских говоров. Русский филологический Вестник, Т. xxxvi и xxxviii, 1896—7.

*Шахматов, А. А. Описание Лекинского говора Егорьевского уезда. Известия отделения русского языка и словесности Акад. Наук, Т. xxxiii, кн. 4, 1913.

*Шахматов, А. А. Очерк древнейшего периода истории русского языка. Энциклопедия славянской филологии. Петроград, 1915.

*Шахматов, А. А. Древнейшие судьбы русского племени. Петроград, 1919.

*Филин, Ф. П. Исследование о лексике русских говоров. Москва-Ленинград, 1936.

REUBEN AVANESOV

Moscow

RUSSIAN LINGUISTICS IN WAR TIME

The alarms and troubles of war-time have not put an end to the work of Soviet linguists, although many of them have left their libraries and studies to take up arms in defence of their country. Personal sacrifices were inevitable, but Soviet linguists have nevertheless emerged successfully from this struggle with external difficulties and are continuing their work effectively.

In these brief notes I would like to give the English reader some idea of what has been done during the past two and a half years. For the sake of completeness and convenience of reference I shall also refer to a few papers that were printed during the first half of 1941, on the eve of the war between Germany and the U.S.S.R.

During the period under discussion considerable advance has been made in the study of the Russian language, a sphere of activity that naturally takes a prominent place in Soviet linguistics. A number of papers have appeared on the history of the Russian literary language. Almost on the eve of the war the first volume of L. A. Bulakhovsky's comprehensive work on the Russian literary language of the early nineteenth century was published in Kiev. The book summarizes a large amount of material on the lexicology and phraseology of the first half of the last century, one of the most brilliant epochs in the history of Russian letters. The author has now completed his work on the second volume, covering questions of phonetics, stress and grammar, and its publication is eagerly awaited by Russian philologists. Another fine piece of research of the same type was V. V. Vinogradov's *Pushkin's Style*, published in October 1941. This paper examines the poet's style from a linguistic viewpoint, dealing mainly with the semantic aspect of his language. Two other papers, published in an Academy symposium entitled *Pushkin—Founder of Modern Russian Literature*, deal with Pushkin's language. One of them, 'Pushkin and the Russian Literary Language of the Nineteenth Century', comes from the pen of the aforementioned Vinogradov, and the second, 'The Heritage of the Eighteenth Century in Pushkin's Poetic Language', was written by the author of this article. Another book of mine has recently been published, *Mayakovsky, an Innovator in Language*, in which I examine a number of new collocations employed by Mayakovsky in his poetry. A number of papers have also appeared on the literary language of various older periods. In the comprehensive many-volumed work on the 'History of Russian Literature' which is being issued by the Academy of Sciences (three volumes have already appeared), there are two articles of interest to linguists, one by the Academician A. S. Orlov on the Old Russian literary language and an article of mine on the language of the early eighteenth century. A Moscow scientific worker, Nikiforov, has published in the *Transactions of the Defectological Institute* a study of the language of Tsar Ivan the Terrible (sixteenth century). Another item of considerable interest is the paper by P. Y. Chernykh describing the language of the 'Ulozheniye' or Legal Code of Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich (1649). The paper was accepted as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philology, and although it has not yet been printed is undoubtedly an extremely valuable contribution to the study of one of the most important documents in the Old Russian language. To round off this group of papers mention must be made of I. A. Ossovetsky's research into word-building in Russian lyrical folk-songs.

A number of interesting papers have appeared on Russian historical grammar and dialectology. It gives me great satisfaction to be able to write of a renewed interest

in the study of Russian syntax. B. I. Lavrov has published an interesting paper on conditional and subjunctive sentences in Old Russian. A. B. Shapiro is just completing a lengthy paper on the syntax of Russian folk-dialects which, judging by extracts that have already been made public, promises to be an extremely interesting work. Shortly before the war a paper by T. P. Lomtev on the 'History of the Compound Predicate in Belorussian' was published in Minsk. A number of papers of a more specialized character have been published in the *Transactions* of various educational establishments, such as, for example, the paper by Irina Ilyinskaya on the history of grammatical government (Moscow) and Serafima Frolova's 'History of the Russian Declension in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries' (Kuibyshev). Elena Tanskaya has produced a very interesting paper on the Russian numerals. Valuable new material on the phonetics of the South Russian dialects is to be found in the paper by Gvozdev (Kuibyshev) and in the excellent, still unpublished, work of R. I. Avanesov (Moscow). Avanesov's research makes necessary a re-examination of a number of questions connected with the history of the Russian language, amongst them the question of the genesis of the so-called Central Russian dialects which formed the basis of the Russian national language. Another paper on dialectology deals with S. S. Vysotsky's recent investigations into the dialects of the Moscow Region. These observations will form the basis of an atlas of Moscow dialects which in turn forms part of a general Russian dialect atlas being compiled by the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. Some interesting conclusions are drawn by B. A. Larin in his research into the history of the dialects of the Vyatka Region, showing the elements of a Finno-Ugric substratum in these dialects. Larin is now putting the finishing touches to what promises to be an interesting book studying the statements made by foreigners on the Russian language during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (Richard James, Henry Ludolf and others). Part of this work was published before the war. Professor L. P. Yakubinsky's (Leningrad) 'Lectures on the History of the Russian Language' are expected to appear shortly.

Work on Russian lexicology has also made progress. Vinogradov has been working on the history of individual words and collocations in connexion with the history of culture (a preliminary summary of this work has appeared in the *Transactions of the Moscow Institute of Defectology*). The Academy of Sciences is still engaged on its three main lexicographical works, the larger, a fifteen-volume dictionary of the Russian language, a dictionary of Old Russian and a smaller, one-volume dictionary of the modern language. The last-named dictionary, popularly known, incidentally, as the 'Russian Larousse', is already in the manuscript stage and is now being prepared for the press. It must be mentioned also that Russian linguists are busy on questions of the general theory of Russian grammar. In addition to a number of papers on narrowly specialized subjects such as word form in Russian, the voice of Russian verbs, nominal suffixes in Russian, a new University Course of Russian Grammar by S. I. Abakumov was published in 1942. An original comprehensive work by Professor Gvozdev (Kuibyshev), *The Language of the Russian Child*, is worthy of especial mention. This two-volume work is based on a systematic observation, covering many years, of the sequence in which the Russian child acquires the grammatical categories of his native tongue. A short outline of the conclusions drawn by Gvozdev has already appeared in the *Transactions of the Kuibyshev Pedagogical Institute*.

In the sphere of the western and southern Slavonic languages, an important recent acquisition is the work of A. M. Selishchev, *Slavonic Linguistics*, in four

volumes. The first volume was published in 1941 and the other three volumes were left in manuscript form on the untimely death of the author after a serious illness at the end of 1942. The first volume dealt with the West Slavonic languages; the second covers Old Church Slavonic and is now in the press. There is no doubt that this monumental work of one of the leading Slav scholars will, when published, occupy an important place amongst the literature on Slavonic languages. Among other works on Slavonic studies I would like to mention a monograph by Professor Bulakhovsky comparing stress in the Slavonic languages, part of which was published in the *Transactions of Kiev University* in 1941, a book by the late P. P. Sveshnikov on the history of the conjunctive in the Balkan languages (in the press), Professor M. V. Sergievsky's still unfinished work on Slav-Rumanian relations and S. B. Bernstein's research work on the history of the Bulgarian language in Wallachia.

One of the outstanding features of Russian linguistics in the years that follow the first world war and the October Revolution is the extensive study that has been made of the non-Slavonic languages of the peoples of the former Russian Empire. During this time a first study has been made of many languages of peoples inhabiting the U.S.S.R., and others, already known, have been studied in greater detail than ever before. Some progress has also been made in this sphere since the war began. N. F. Yakovlev, one of the leading Soviet specialists in Caucasian languages, has published, in collaboration with D. Ashkamaf, a comprehensive grammar of the Adygei language covering the morphology and syntax of the language preceded by an extremely interesting foreword on the genesis and evolution of languages. Another leading figure in Caucasian studies, Professor L. I. Zhirkov, has published a valuable grammar of a hitherto poorly studied language, the Lesgin, in which he explains some new discoveries concerning the sounds and stress in this language. During the war years some research has also been carried out on the Turkic and Finno-Ugric languages of the Soviet Union (Azerbaijani, Tartar, Bashkir, Udmurt and others) and, what is more important, the more recent papers were written by local scientific workers, most of them young people of the nationalities concerned. An example of this is the paper written by a young Bashkirian scientific worker, Harisov, on 'Aspect in the Bashkirian Verb'. The paper was accepted as a thesis for his candidate's (Master's) Degree and was successfully defended in public at Moscow University on 10 December 1942; Harisov was given special leave of absence from the army in order to defend the thesis and appeared at the meeting in uniform. The official opponents, Professors Dmitriev and Nasilov, both of them well-known scholars working in the sphere of Turkic languages, drew the attention of the Senate to the fact that this is the first scientific paper ever written on the Bashkirian language by a young Bashkirian research worker. Bulychev, a young Udmurt linguist, recently read a thesis on word order in his native language.

To conclude I would like to draw attention to the fact that during the war years Soviet linguists have also published a number of papers on West-European languages. Professor Shishmarov, a leading Soviet specialist in Romance languages, has published his *Notes on the History of the Languages of Spain*, in which he gives an interesting and detailed picture of the history of the Basque, Spanish, Catalan and Galico-Portuguese languages. P. S. Kuznetsov published a paper in the *Transactions of the Moscow City Pedagogical Institute*, a fine and extremely valuable study of the phonology of the French language. A quite original grammar of the French language has been written by Professors K. Ganshina and M. Peterson.

Amongst other text-books of this category the German Grammar by N. G. Gadd and L. Y. Brave written in line with the Academician N. V. Shcherba's ideas on grammar is worthy of special mention.

Two interesting pamphlets in the realm of applied linguistics have been written by a well-known Russian polyglot, N. V. Yushmanov, for use in war-time. One of them contains instructions on how to decide in what language a document is written by purely external signs. The pamphlet contains instructions for 170 languages. The other pamphlet by the same author is a *Key to Latinised Scripts* and contains all the data necessary for reading any language which employs the Latin alphabet. Both these pamphlets have been compiled with very great thoroughness.

Another interesting paper is the history of liaison in French by Kappe.

Unfortunately space does not permit me to go into the detailed discussion which many of the works mentioned undoubtedly merit. My object has been to give a simple list of works, both printed and in course of preparation, sufficient to show that linguistics, a science which occupies an important position in Russian culture and which has developed considerably during the last thirty or forty years, is still flourishing despite the difficulties inevitable in war-time.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(a) THESES

1. Булычев, М. Н. Порядок слов в удмуртском простом предложении. 1943. Московский Университет имени Ломоносова. На степень кандидата.
BULYCHEV, M. N. 'Word Order in the Udmurt Simple Sentence.' 1943. Moscow University. Thesis for Candidate's Degree.
2. Высотский, С. С. Юго-западные подмосковные говоры. 1941. Московский Институт Философии, Истории и Литературы имени Чернышевского. На степень кандидата.
VYSOTSKY, S. S. 'Dialects in the Region South-west of Moscow.' 1941. Chernyshevsky Institute of Philosophy, History and Literature. Thesis for Candidate's Degree.
3. Гвоздев, А. Н. Язык русского ребенка. 1942. Московский Университет имени Ломоносова. На степень доктора.
GVOZDEV, A. N. 'The Language of the Russian Child.' 1942. Moscow University. Thesis for Doctor's Degree.
4. Жигадло, В. Н. Предлоги современного английского языка. 1943. Московский Университет имени Ломоносова. На степень кандидата.
ZHIGADLO, V. N. 'Prepositions in Modern English.' 1943. Moscow University. Thesis for Candidate's Degree.
5. Каппе, Л. И. К истории liaison во французском языке. 1942. Московский Университет имени Ломоносова. На степень кандидата.
КАППЕ, L. I. 'On the History of Liaison in French.' 1942. Moscow University. Thesis for Candidate's Degree.
6. Оссовецкий, И. А. Словообразование в русской народной лирической песне. 1941. Московский Институт Философии, Истории и Литературы. На степень кандидата.
OSSOVETSKY, I. A. 'Word-building in the Russian Lyrical Folksongs.' 1941. Chernyshevsky Institute of Philosophy, History and Literature. Thesis for Candidate's Degree.
7. Свешников, П. П. К истории инфинитива в балканских языках. 1942. Московский Городской Педагогический Институт. На степень кандидата.
SVESHNIKOV, P. P. 'On the History of the Infinitive in Balkan Languages.' 1942. Moscow City Pedagogical Institute. Thesis for Candidate's Degree.

8. Танская, Е. П. История количественных числительных в книжном русском языке. Московский Институт Философии, Истории и Литературы имени Чернышевского. На степень кандидата.
TANSKAYA, E. P. 'The History of Cardinal Numbers in Written Russian.' Chernyshevsky Institute of Philosophy, History and Literature. Thesis for Candidate's Degree.
9. Харисов, Б. М. Виды в башкирском языке. 1942. Московский Университет имени Ломоносова. На степень кандидата.
HARISOV, B. M. 'Verbal Aspect in Bashkirian.' 1942. Moscow University. Thesis for Candidate's Degree.
10. Черных, П. Я. Язык Уложения 1649 г. 1942. Московский Университет имени Ломоносова. На степень доктора.
CHERNYKH, P. Y. 'The Language of the Legal Codex of 1649.' 1942. Moscow University. Thesis for Doctor's Degree.

(b) PRINTED WORKS

11. Абакумов, С. Современный русский литературный язык. Москва, 1942.
ABAUMOV, S. *The Modern Russian Literary Language*. Moscow, 1942.
12. Булаховский, Л. А. Русский литературный язык первой половины XIX в. Т. I. Лексика и общие замечания о слоге. Киев, 1941.
BULAKHOVSKY, L. A. *The Russian Literary Language of the Early Nineteenth Century*. Vol. I. Lexicology and General Notes on the Syllable. Kiev, 1941.
13. Виноградов, В. В. Стиль Пушкина. Москва, 1941.
VINOGRADOV, V. V. *Pushkin's Style*. Moscow, 1941.
14. Винокур, Г. И. Маяковский новатор языка. Москва, 1943.
VINOCUR, G. I. *Mayakovsky, an Innovator in Language*. Moscow, 1943.
15. Гадд, Н. Г. и Браве, Л. Я. Грамматика немецкого языка под редакцией проф. Л. В. Щербы. Москва, 1942.
GADD, N. G., & BRAVE, L. Y. *Grammar of the German Language*. Edited by Professor L. V. Shcherba. Moscow, 1942.
16. Жирков, Л. Грамматика лезгинского языка. Махач-Кала, 1941.
ZHIRKOV, L. *Grammar of the Lesgin Language*. Makhach-Kala, 1941.
17. Лавров, В. И. Условные и уступительные предложения в древне-русском языке. Москва-Ленинград, 1941.
LAVROV, V. I. *Conditional and Subjunctive Sentences in Old Russian*. Moscow-Leningrad, 1941.
18. Ломтев, Т. П. Исследования в области истории белорусского синтаксиса. Ученые записки Белорусского Государственного Университета. Минск, 1941.
LOMTEV, T. P. 'Research in the Field of Belorussian Syntax.' *Transactions of the Belorussian University*. Minsk, 1941.
19. Селищев, А. М. Славянское языкознание. Т. I. Западнославянские языки. Москва, 1941.
SELISHCHEV, A. M. *Slavonic Linguistics*. Vol. I. West-Slavonic Languages. Moscow, 1941.
20. Селищев, А. М. Пушкин—родоначальник новой русской литературы. Москва-Ленинград, 1941.
SELISHCHEV, A. M. *Pushkin—Founder of Modern Russian Literature*. Moscow-Leningrad, 1941.
21. Селищев, А. М. История русской литературы (издание Академии Наук). ТТ. I, II, v. Москва-Ленинград, 1941.
SELISHCHEV, A. M. *The History of Russian Literature*. (Published by the Academy of Sciences.) Vols. I, II, v. Moscow-Leningrad, 1941.
22. Селищев, А. М. Науков Записки/Академия Наук УРСР/. Киев, 1941.
SELISHCHEV, A. M. *Transactions of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences*. Kiev, 1941.

23. Селищев, А. М. Ученые записки Куибышевского Государственного Педагогического и Учительского Института. Выпуск 5, 1942; вып. 7, 1943.
SELISHCHEV, A. M. *Transactions of the Kuibyshev Pedagogical Institute*. No. 5, 1942; No. 7, 1943.
24. Селищев, А. М. Ученые Записки Московского Городского Педагогического Института, том V, вып. 1, 1941.
SELISHCHEV, A. M. *Transactions of the Moscow City Pedagogical Institute*. Vol. V, No. 1, 1941.
25. Селищев, А. М. Ученые Записки Московского Государственного Педагогического Дефектологического Института. Т. I, 1941.
SELISHCHEV, A. M. *Transactions of the Moscow State Pedagogical Institute of Defectology*. Vol. I, 1941.
26. Шишмарев, В. Ф. Очерки по истории языков Испании. Москва-Ленинград, 1941.
SHISHMAREV, V. F. *Notes on the History of the Languages of Spain*. Moscow-Leningrad, 1941.
27. Юшманов, Н. В. Ключ к латинским письменностям земного шара. Москва-Ленинград, 1941.
YUSHMANOV, N. V. *Key to Latin scripts of the World*. Moscow-Leningrad, 1941.
28. Яковлев, Н. и Ашхамаф, Д. Грамматика адыгейского литературного языка. Москва-Ленинград, 1941.
YAKOVLEV, N., & ASHKHMAF, D. *Grammar of the Adygei Literary Language*. Moscow-Leningrad, 1941.

GRIGORY VINOKUR

Moscow

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

THY POLE-CLIPT VINEYARD, 'THE TEMPEST', IV, 1, 68

One of the cruxes in the masque of Iris, Ceres and Juno in *The Tempest* is, strangely enough, the interpretation of *pole-clipt* in the phrase *thy pole-clipt vineyard* (IV, 1, 68). The New Variorum Edition devotes nearly a whole page (p. 203) to the meaning and scansion of the unique compound *pole-clipt* and the scansion of *vineyard*. Up to 1892, when the New Variorum Edition of *The Tempest* was published, *pole-clipt* had been interpreted as meaning either: (1) with the poles twined round by vines (Holt, Steevens, Furness); or (2) hedged in with poles (Schmidt). In both cases *clipt* had been taken as the past participle of the verb *clip* (OE. *clyppan*) 'to embrace'. Only one dissenting voice had been heard, viz. that of Heath (1765); in defending Warburton's (1747) emendation *pale-clipt* Heath suggested that Warburton might have recollected that 'clip' signified also 'prune' and consequently that the compound might here signify that the vines by proper pruning were trained up to the poles which supported them. Furness, expressing the opinion that Heath was in error, regrets that his influence could be traced via Delius, who adopted Heath's suggestion, to 'the excellent Schmidt', whose definition of *pole-clipt* is 'hedged in with poles' (*Shakespeare-Lexicon*).

Since Furness little or no attention has been given to the question; his verdict appears to have become, to all intents and purposes, the final word in the matter. Thus the Warwick Shakespeare (*The Tempest*, ed. by F. S. Boas) translates *pole-clipt vineyard* as 'the vineyard in which the vines are twined about the poles' (p. 142), explaining further that the passive form of the participle is here used actively. The New Clarendon Shakespeare (*The Tempest*, ed. by J. R. Sutherland, Oxford, 1939) glosses *pole-clipt* (p. 88) 'with poles clasped (by vines)',¹ whereas the so-called New Cambridge Edition (ed. by Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch and J. D. Wilson) bestows neither a note nor a gloss on the word. The *N.E.D.*, following Schmidt, renders it 'hedged in by poles', and G. L. Kittredge (*The Tempest*, Boston, 1939, p. 134) gives the non-committal explanation: 'vineyard surrounded by poles (for the vines to grow on); or vineyard whose poles are embraced by vines'.

Neither of these interpretations is convincing or even acceptable. On the contrary, *pole-clipt*, meaning 'embraced by poles' and referring to a fenced-in vineyard, is a type of conceit that, though not foreign to Shakespeare, is extremely forced or strained. Nor is it attractive to have to juggle with passive participles that suddenly become active and to render *pole-clipt* as 'clipping or embracing the pole', even though similar cases do occur in Shakespeare, e.g. *her deserved* (= des-serving) *children* (*Coriolanus*, III, 1, 292).

The solution to the problem is, indeed, so obvious that it is almost embarrassing to present it. For about two centuries Shakespeare editors and commentators have been hypnotized by the spelling *pole* and have failed to see that it also stands for *poll*, as for instance in the first Folio of *Hamlet* (IV, 5, 196): 'All Flaxen was his

¹ This seems to be the meaning favoured by foreign translators of Shakespeare. In Carl August Hagberg's excellent Swedish translation (Vol. 11, *Stormen*, p. 52) *thy pole-clipt vineyard* is rendered rather freely 'du som den späda

rankan binder opp', and Friedrich Gundolf, who in 1925 published *Shakespeare in deutscher Sprache*, 'zum Teil neu übersetzt' (a revision of Tieck's translation), writes: 'dein pfahlgestützter Rebengang' (Vol. 5, p. 533).

Pole' (*pole* is the spelling of all the *Hamlet* Quartos and Folios). The meaning of *poll* according to *N.E.D.* is 'head' and 'top or crown of a hat or cap'; the *E.D.D.* has a more adequate definition: 'the top or crown of anything'. Note also the verb *poll*, 'to cut off the top of a tree or plant, to pollard', and such compounds as *poll-sheep*, *pollbarley*. The second part of the compound is the participle of *clip* (ME. *clippen*),¹ 'to cut with scissors or shears'. *Pole-clipt* consequently means 'pruned, pollarded', with reference to the practice of pruning the grapevine in spring or, to use Shakespeare's own phrase in line 65, in 'spongy April'; for an account of this operation I refer to the article 'Vine' in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.

HELGE KÖKERITZ

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

NOTE ON 'M.L.R.' 1943, p. 128

Dr P. Simpson's statement that Shakespeare avoids the licence of rhyming a masculine ending with a feminine one needs a qualification which, in fact, confirms it:

Through which the lovers, Pyramus and Thisby,
Did whisper often very secretly.

Midsummer Night's Dream, v, i, 161-2.

P. MAAS

OXFORD

A MISPRINT IN MARMION'S 'HOLLAND'S LEAGUER'.

When Shakerly Marmion appropriated a story from Apuleius's *Metamorphoses* (I, 9) for inclusion in his *Holland's Leaguer* (v, iii), his printer mistook the translation of *castor* for *bezer* instead of *bever*. The error, appearing in the first edition of the play, in 1632, renders Marmion's passage senseless since, according to *N.E.D.*, *bezoar*, with variants *bezer*, *bezar*, *beazer*, etc., means antidote, or counterpoison, while Marmion, following Apuleius, was telling the story of a witch who transformed her faithless lover into a beaver so that he would, according to the popular misconception of that animal's nature, castrate himself by biting out his genitals to throw in the path of his pursuers in order to impede their progress and thereby prevent his own capture and subsequent death.

Bezer was emended to *bezar* by Maidment and Logan in their faulty edition, *The Dramatic Works of Shackerley Marmion*, in 1875, the second and last treatment of *Holland's Leaguer*. Ignorant of Marmion's source, and therefore not realizing that *bezer* was meant for a translation of *castor* from Apuleius in the lines,

... when her husband has followed
Strange women, shee has turned him into a Bezer,
And made him bite out his owne stones, (v, iii.)

the editors turned to Thomas Blount's *Glossographia* for clarification. There they found *beazar-stone* defined as a cordial used in physic and further described as breeding in the maw of the goat called a beazar. Without further comment they accepted Blount's irrelevant information as adequate explanation of *bezer* and *stones* in Marmion's passage and left it as a footnote there. (*N.E.D.* names the

¹ ME. *clippen* is generally believed to be a loan from ON., but the existence of the boundary-mark *þa geclyppedan treowa* in a tenth-century charter

from the Isle of Wight may point to native origin; see my *Place-Names of the Isle of Wight* (Uppsala, 1940), p. 90 f.

bezoar goat, the wild goat of Persia, as the best-known source of bezoar-stone, a calculus which is sometimes formed by concentric layers of animal matter deposited around a foreign substance as a nucleus in the stomach or intestines of animals, chiefly ruminants.)

The natural history involved in Marmion's borrowed story was well known in the seventeenth century. Sir Thomas Browne devoted a whole chapter in his *Vulgar Errors* (III, 4) to a refutation of the popular tradition that the beaver bit out either his testicles or the musk sacs sometimes mistaken for them when hunters were chasing him. He does not mention any confusion of *bever* and *bezer* as a translation of *castor*; neither would Marmion have made such an error.

The printer's mistake, misprinting *bezer* for *bever* in *Holland's Leaguer*, is readily understandable although it destroyed Marmion's sense and intention for over three hundred years. It was a simple misreading of the Italian hand, made doubly easy by the occurrence of *stones* in the line following *bever* to suggest *bezer-stones*.

SUE MAXWELL

BIRMINGHAM, ALABAMA

HENRY AND THOMAS VAUGHAN

From Anthony à Wood's accounts¹ it is clear that Henry and Thomas Vaughan were closely associated during their first eighteen years, up to the time when Henry left Oxford University and Thomas remained. To what extent their personal contacts continued during the remaining twenty-six years of Thomas's life is as yet obscure. Although most of the facts bearing on the problem are variously recognized in criticism on the two writers, no one has seen fit to assemble the evidence for an examination of the theory still current that shortly after their first separation about 1640 the brothers were again in close touch with each other for five or seven years during the 1640's, when Thomas is said to have occupied the rectory in his native parish of St Bridget's, in Wales.² A summary of the evidence now accessible and an examination of its implications therefore seem important.

Thomas Vaughan entered Jesus College, Oxford, on 14 December 1638 and took the B.A. degree on 18 February 1642.³ Although it is almost certain that Henry

¹ *Athenae Oxonienses*, ed. Philip Bliss (London, 1813-20), III, 722-6; IV, 425-6.

² The theory begins with Henry Vaughan's first modern editor, the Rev. H. F. Lyte (*Silex Scintillans*, London, 1847, pp. xi-xlix), who supplements Wood's account of the appointment of Thomas to St Bridget's with the more intimate detail that he 'went to reside there, close to his brother Henry'. Lyte continues with the supposition that on leaving his residence in Newton Thomas took with him Henry's *Olor Iscanus* and three years later published it himself. That the brothers were closely associated in the Newton community during the 1640's is also assumed by A. B. Grosart (*Works of Vaughan*, The Fuller Worthies' Library, 1871, II, 302-3) and given wide currency in subsequent criticism. See H. C. Beeching, *Poems of Henry Vaughan*, ed. E. K. Chambers (London, 1896), I, pp. xix, xxv; A. C. Judson, 'The Source of Henry Vaughan's Ideas concerning God in Nature', *Studies in Philology*, XXIV (1927), 594; P. E. More, 'Henry Vaughan',

in *The Demon of the Absolute* (Princeton, 1928), pp. 144, 147, 154; Elizabeth Holmes, *Henry Vaughan and the Hermetic Philosophy* (Oxford, 1932), pp. 15-16; W. O. Clough, 'Henry Vaughan and the Hermetic Philosophy', *PMLA*, XLVIII (1933), 1116; J. B. Leishman, *The Metaphysical Poets* (Oxford, 1934), p. 145; Ralph M. Wardle, 'Thomas Vaughan's Influence upon the Poetry of Henry Vaughan', *PMLA*, LI (1936), 937-8; Helen C. White, *The Metaphysical Poets* (New York, 1936), pp. 263, 269-70. Compare also Eva Martin, 'Thomas Vaughan, Magician', *The Fortnightly Review*, CXV (1924), 406. Of these, Miss Holmes alone is convinced (because of similarity in the writings) that the brothers continued close relations after Thomas's eviction. Thomas's residence in the Newton community is usually regarded in recent criticism as extending from 1642 to 1649, although there is mention of 1640 and 1647 as terminal dates.

³ Joseph Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses* (1891-2), IV, 1538.

matriculated with Thomas,¹ he left Oxford about 1640 and went to London to study law.² His study of law, however, was 'wholie frustrated' in 1642, at which time he apparently went directly to his home in Wales. But just how or where he spent the next five years is largely a matter of conjecture. It is practically certain that he was with the Royalist army for at least a part of 1645.³ His *Poems* (1646), quite probably written before 1642,⁴ were registered on 15 September 1646, and the following year he wrote a dedication for another volume, which included poems written during 1642-7.⁵ The first actual record of Henry's residence in Newton after 1640 is contained in his dedication of the latter work on 17 December 1647.

Thomas Vaughan was made Rector of St Bridget's at some time after his graduation in 1642,⁶ and probably shortly after that date. It is not known, however, when or even whether he assumed the duties of this post. It is possible that his incumbency is recorded in the vague statement of Theophilus Jones that 'a farm house called, Newton . . . was of some celebrity in the seventeenth century, and was once occupied by two brothers, of the name of Vaughan, of very eccentric characters'.⁷ John Walker, despite his confusion about the identity of his subject, provides the information that Thomas was expelled from his living at St Bridget's, principally 'for having been in *Arms* for the *King*'.⁸ It appears that Thomas's military service, whenever its beginning, did not continue after the end of his incumbency at St Bridget's, and it seems likely that his tenure of the benefice was brief. Theophilus Jones states that his eviction came 'shortly after he had taken possession of his living',⁹ and according to H. F. Lyte, who also refers to Thomas's service in the Royalist army (and who probably gathered details from Walker, Wood and Jones), Thomas returned to Oxford on his expulsion in 1648 after a short term as rector in his native parish.¹⁰ It is worth noting here that the dedication of his *Anthroposophia Theomagica* (1650) is dated 'Oxford, 1648'. No less relevant is the statement in Henry's letter to John Aubrey (15 July 1673), in which Thomas's appointment to St Bridget's is merely mentioned, that whereas he himself left Oxford (about 1640) 'my brother continued there for ten or 12 years, and (I thinke) he could be noe lesse than M^r of Arts'.¹¹

From Henry's prefaces and letters it is reasonably certain that Newton was his home from 1647 till his death, in 1695. It is no less apparent that Thomas spent most of the last eighteen or twenty years of his life in Oxford and London. But there is as yet no evidence that this separation of the brothers followed a long period of personal association or that it weakened their interest in each other.¹²

¹ Henry's letters show that he was an Oxford man, even though the incomplete records of the University during his time afford no account of his registration.

² See *Athenae Oxonienses*, iv, 425, and *Works of Vaughan*, ed. L. C. Martin (Oxford, 1914), ii, 667.

³ See my article on 'Henry Vaughan and the Civil War', *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, xli (1942), 514-26.

⁴ See William R. Parker, 'Henry Vaughan and his Publishers', *The Library*, Fourth Series, xx (1940), 403.

⁵ Compare Parker, *The Library*, pp. 408-10, and Harold R. Walley, 'The Strange Case of *Olor Iscanus*', *The Review of English Studies*, xviii (1942), 30-3.

⁶ *Athenae Oxonienses*, iii, 722.

⁷ *A History of the County of Brecknock* (Brecknock, 1898), ii, 435. (First edition, 1805-9.)

⁸ *Sufferings of the Clergy* (London, 1714), pp. 389-90. Walker's failure to recognize variant names for Thomas's parish led him to the erroneous conclusion that Thomas Vaughan of Llansaintfread was not the Thomas Vaughan of St Bridget's whom Wood describes.

⁹ Op. cit. ii, 435. ¹⁰ Op. cit. pp. xix-xx.

¹¹ *Works*, ed. Martin, ii, 667.

¹² Commentators have overlooked the most important evidence of continued close contact between the brothers during the 1640's. Thomas's commendatory poem in *Olor Iscanus* (*Works*, ed. Martin, i, 37-8), which, as Parker points out, was probably written in 1647, shows clearly that he was more than casually familiar with Henry's literary activities at this time.

The inadequacy of details concerning Thomas in Henry's letters (beginning seven years after Thomas's death), despite an obvious interest in supplying materials for Thomas's biography, need not encourage assumption that the omissions were more than inadvertences, for Henry did no better for his own biography. The fact that in 1673 he could not say definitely whether Thomas took the Master of Arts degree during his ten or twelve years at Oxford is quite probably no more significant than was his inability, a month later,¹ to indicate the name of the village in which his brother was buried, the location of which he could describe quite distinctly. It is more important that *Daphnis*, an elegiac poem on Thomas,² written probably in 1666, and almost certainly not much later, discloses an appreciative understanding of Thomas's connexion during his later years with Sir Robert Murray. This detail Henry remembers to mention some seven years later in a letter to Aubrey, in which he also lists five of Thomas's works (all published during 1650-1) and supplies the names and addresses of the publishers.³

With these indications of Henry's familiarity with Thomas's activities during the 1650's should be considered also the evidence pointed out by William R. Parker⁴ that Thomas arranged publication of Henry's *Silex Scintillans*, *The Mount of Olives*, and the augmented *Silex Scintillans*, registered on 28 March 1650, 16 December 1651, 20 March 1655, respectively.⁵ Thomas was probably living in London when he did his own publishing of 1650-1. He was married on 28 September 1651,⁶ and lodged with his wife 'att Mr Coalemans in Holborne [in London], before wee came to live att the Pinner of Wakefield'.⁷ And here should be observed a reference in Thomas's note-book (apparently covering the years 1658-9) to a number of household articles which included 'a great glass full of eye-water, made att the pinner of Wakefield, by my deare wife, and my sister vaughan, who are both now with god'.⁸ Since the occasion of this sharing of domestic interests by the brothers' wives⁹ cannot have been before 1651, this reference also contains significant implications which have not been sufficiently acknowledged. And these details, which cannot be made to conform with the current assumption that Thomas's departure from St Bridget's signalized a decline in the brothers' mutual interests, lose none of their implications when related to an intercepted letter of Thomas to Charles Roberts dated at 'Newton, Ash-Wednesday, 1653',¹⁰ and plainly occasioned by an intense and familiar interest in certain activities affecting his native community.

Obviously, until additional biographical information on Henry and Thomas Vaughan is uncovered, there can be no wholly satisfactory account of their relationships after 1640. Still, from this review of the relevant facts, the theory that close association of the brothers during their mature years was contingent upon a long residence of Thomas at St Bridget's appears to be not merely without basis, but actually in conflict with the evidence. Under close examination, the assumption

¹ Letter to Aubrey, *Works*, ed. Martin, II, 670-1.

² *Works*, ed. Martin, II, 656-60.

³ *Ibid.* II, 667-8.

⁴ *The Library*, pp. 401-11.

⁵ At the same time Parker disposes of the notion, beginning with Lyte, that Thomas Vaughan published *Olor Iscanus*, which is, ironically, an integral part of the theory under consideration.

⁶ *Works of Thomas Vaughan*, ed. A. E. Waite (1919), p. 446.

⁷ B.M. Sloane MS. 1741, f. 104 v.

⁸ *Ibid.* f. 106 v.

⁹ The twins apparently had only a younger brother, about whom almost nothing is known. Thomas's wife died on 17 April 1658 (*Works*, ed. Waite, p. 446). From 'To Amoret Weeping' (*Works*, ed. Martin, I, 13-14) it is apparent that Henry Vaughan was married as early as 1646; and the augmented *Silex Scintillans* (1655) contains poems which commentators believe to have been inspired by the recent death of his wife.

¹⁰ *State Papers of John Thurloe*, col. Thomas Birch (London, 1742), II, 120-1.

that Thomas left Oxford to assume the duties of his living remains unconfirmed, and the further supposition that he was established in St Bridget's for five years or more during the 1640's becomes almost certainly an error. Neither assumption, however, is necessary as proof of personal contact between Thomas and Henry during this period, the actual evidence for which is only a little less manifest than that which testifies to continued mutual interests after 1650. Careful examination of accessible evidence justifies the conclusion that normally close association continued throughout Thomas's life. Until the details summarized here are supplemented by new discoveries, attempts to define more specifically the relationships between Henry and Thomas Vaughan for any part of the period of 1640-66 can result only in unprofitable guessing.

E. L. MARILLA

BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA

'NEWS FROM PLIMOUTH' AND SIR POSITIVE AT-ALL

A recent article by Mr Blackmore Evans, 'The source of Shadwell's character of Sir Formal Trifle', in *The Modern Language Review*¹ suggests a possible source for Sir Positive At-all in *The Sullen Lovers*. Mr Evans's main contention is that the doddering old Sir Solemne Trifle in William Davenant's play *News from Plimouth* would probably have been known to Shadwell since he provides the name and in many ways the pattern for Sir Formal Trifle in *The Virtuoso*. Several similarities persuade us, says Mr Evans, that Shadwell was not quite truthful in the statement in his preface that his four humours were 'new', since these likenesses can hardly have been due to pure coincidence. The very boring Sir Solemne likes to talk at great length and is developed against a background of younger people who, growing tired of his absurdities, work out a highly diverting scheme to get rid of him. In *The Virtuoso* the young people beg him to make an extempore speech. Much flattered, Sir Formal launches, in oratorical style, into a diatribe on 'The mouse in a trap'. Half-way through, when a trap door is sprung, Sir Formal disappears from view, and from his opportunity to annoy the youngsters. This device Mr Evans feels might have developed from the idea advanced by Seawit in *News from Plimouth* of having Sir Solemne go into an empty gallery to practise a speech on 'The nine worthies', and so take himself out of the way.

The arguments for Shadwell's use of this play in *The Virtuoso* seem to me quite valid; for his use of it in *The Sullen Lovers* they seem rather feeble. *News from Plimouth* was first printed in the Davenant folio in 1673 and so could easily have been in Shadwell's hands before the writing of *The Virtuoso*, which was produced in 1678. But *The Sullen Lovers* was produced in 1668. It is possible that, as Mr Evans suggests, Shadwell saw the play in manuscript before publication, but we have no evidence that he did. A chief point of similarity is that the old man loves to talk with 'art, judgment, language and elegance of phrase', and professes to hate 'impertinence and babbling'. In Shadwell's play Sir Positive and Lady Vaine provide the 'impertinence and babbling'—and others object to it—but the use of the word *impertinence* is perhaps of significance. The second point is Sir Solemne's conceit. This quality, however, is so characteristic of Sir Robert Howard himself—and Sir Positive is largely a satire upon Sir Robert—as to require no further original. The third point, which Mr Evans stresses, is Sir Solemne's continual interruption of the remarks of his companions with the assurance that he knows

¹ *Modern Language Review*, xxxv (1940), 211-14.

'what you would say'. This habit, also, and the statement about him that 'the perpetual motion is in his tongue', can hardly be considered as more important sources for Sir Positive's characteristics than Sir Robert's fondness for dominating all conversation, and his loquaciousness. The following brief passages, which are typical of the long-winded Sir Solemne, indicate that any claim for Shadwell's use of this character in drawing Sir Positive At-all rests on very slight evidence:

Trifle. Give me leave,
I know what you would say, but with your favour
I'll do't, and spare your blushes; for she is
Extremely modest you would say, and noble.
You would answer
(For here I know your thoughts) were plain and cheap,
And answer'd in no part my full desires
With cost, and curiosity, to feast
Such brave Commanders. Lady, I hope I have nick'd it,
But pray you forbear your thanks for't, 'tis suppos'd
Nay, Gallants, give me leave, you would reply,
Her bounty did transcend, and perhaps add,
That though the name of hospitality
Is lost, nay dead, in her it is reviv'd.
If any can say more, let me be put
Out of commission for it, or what is worse,
speak what concerns me only.

Lov. The perpetual motion
Is in his Tongue I think.

Seawit. I never read of
Such a long-winded Monster.

Trifle. You consent.
(For so your silence warrants) all is spoken
And aptly too on both parts, that could be
Imagin'd, or expected, if there be
A doubt remaining I'll dilate it further.¹

Enter Trifle (drunk). Imagines himself in a sea fight.

Trifle. Touch me not, if you do, you are blown up;
I am all Gun-powder, and Bullet, Lady.
We have done the King such service.

Lov. What, deare Uncle?

Trifle. We have pepper'd the Holland Hulkes, I saw three of 'em
Through the smoke in the Gun-rooms sink, while I bestride
The Canon, and caper'd. Goe get me pen and paper.

(Falls in his Chaire.)

I'll write the courrant myself, & have it Printed
By a Stationer of mine own, one that shall do it
In spite of the Statute, for — (*Nods and sleeps.*)²

In strong contrast to this half-meaningless verbosity is the crisp style of all Sir Positive's remarks. Two brief citations will make this point clear:

Sir Pos. Now he talkes of that, *Stanford*, I'll tell thee what a Master I am of those Languages; I have found out in the Progress of my Study, I must confess with some diligence, four and twenty Greek and Latine words for Black Puddens & Sausages.³

Stanf. Sir I am just going to a *Lawyer* of the Temple to aske his Councell.

Sir Pos. P'shaw, P'shaw; save thy Money, what needs't thou do that, I'll do't for you; why I have more Law, then ever *Cooke* upon *Littleton* had; you must know, I am so eminent at that, that the greatest Lawyers in *England* come to me for advice in matters of difficulty: Come state your Case, let's heart.⁴

¹ William Davenant, *News from Plimouth* (1673), p. 6.

³ Shadwell, *The Sullen Lovers* (1668), pp. 68–9.

² Davenant, *op. cit.* p. 14.

⁴ Ibid. p. 56.

There are some similarities, it is true, between the two men—such as the love of talking and the writing of a *courant*—but in spite of that fact only a weak case can be made out for Sir Solemne Trifle as the source for Sir Positive At-all. In every instance cited a nearer pattern exists in Howard's known qualities. Moreover, the style of the conversation is distinctly different. The passages just quoted, typical of the whole play, show that Sir Positive's statements are always clear-cut and vigorous, even though repetitious, and characteristic of Howard's dynamic personality at the time the satire was drawn; they are never in any way suggestive of the babblings of an old man. In every scene Sir Positive seems more three-dimensional and more convincing, even in his absurdities. In other words, Sir Positive At-all is so largely a portrait of Sir Robert Howard that it seems futile to seek a literary source for the character.

FLORENCE R. SCOTT

LOS ANGELES

THE 'CENT NOUVELLES NOUVELLES' AND 'PATHELIN'

In his note on the date of the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles*¹ Dr W. R. Cunningham, dealing with a previous note by Mr J. H. Watkins, adopts Champion's view of the relationship between the *Nouvelles* and the *Farce de Pathelin*. Generally he appears to hold, with Champion and against Watkins, that the reference *on m'a bien baillé de l'oye* in Nouvelle 33 helps to date *Pathelin* rather than the Nouvelle itself. He mentions, too, Mr Watkins's unawareness of Champion's reference to the relationship between the two, but in his turn he seems as unaware as Mr Watkins of other references, particularly those by Professor R. T. Holbrook in 1917² and Professor Mario Roques in 1931.³ The latter is most important.

If M. Roques is correct—and I see no reason to doubt his conclusions—then the 'allusion' to *Pathelin* is, in fact, not an allusion at all. He claims that the evidence tends to show that the author of *Pathelin* was not the originator of the expression *bailler de l'oye*, that the noun has one spelling when it appears in the expression in question and another when it occurs outside the expression. He concludes that the author was merely bringing a well-known saying into his farce. If that is so, then the 'allusion' within the 33rd Nouvelle is not necessarily to the *Pathelin*, and hence, if not entirely irrelevant to the date of the *Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles* or of *Pathelin*, is at least of no sure value as a factor in the discussion.

KENNETH URWIN

CARDIFF

¹ *Mod. Lang. Rev.* July 1943.

² *Etude sur Pathelin*, 1917.

³ *Romania*, 1931.

REVIEWS

Introduction to Semantics. By RUDOLF CARNAP. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1942. xii+264 pp. 20s.

Nearly half a century has passed since the appearance of Michel Bréal's *Essai de Sémantique* and yet no systematic analysis of the signifying function of language has been undertaken which may be compared with the ambitious book which lies before us, even when due consideration is given to notable contributions by Wundt, de Saussure, Oertel, Nyrop, Delacroix, Brunot, Carnoy and others. For the first time semantics, side by side with syntax and pragmatics, is treated as one of the three branches of semiotic. In this wider sense, semantics is concerned not only with the meaning of expressions but also inevitably with the theory of truth and the theory of logical deduction. Truth and logical consequence are concepts based on the relation of designation and hence they may be regarded as semantic concepts. Semantics, like syntax, may concern itself with features or with systems: it may therefore be 'descriptive' or it may be 'pure'. The present study is limited to statements or declarative sentences and it is limited still further to pure semantics, pure syntax and their relations.

At first glance, then, the title may seem too short and even misleading. Professor Carnap admits that he had weighed the merits of 'systematics' and 'systemics', suggested by K. R. Symon, and 'logical grammar', used by L. Wittgenstein. His work is highly technical and highly empirical and the time is not yet ripe for the formulation of a satisfactory nomenclature. The new systematization of logic will necessitate the framing of a new terminology which will naturally depend upon the structure of the whole theory. This structure may be subject to considerable changes 'even in the near future, since everything is still in the first stages of development'.

The author acknowledges his debt to the work of the famous Warsaw school of logicians led by A. Tarski, S. Lesniewski and T. Kotarbinski. To Tarski he owes much in the present book which may be regarded as the general and indispensable introduction to a series of volumes bearing the common title *Studies in Semantics*. The second volume, *Formalization of Logic*, is already well advanced. This *Introduction* is itself an interim report liable to later revision. In the meantime, every possible aid is given to the reader, in the form of summaries, cross-references and definitions of terms, to enable him to find his way about and to correlate evidence for himself. It is too early to foretell how far this method of approach is likely to lead to fruitful results, but it is certainly attractive. A warm welcome should be accorded to this enterprising attempt to analyse meaning with the help of the exact instruments of modern logic.

SIMEON POTTER

SOUTHAMPTON

Medieval and Renaissance Studies, Vol. I, No. 2. Edited by RICHARD HUNT and RAYMOND KLIBANSKY. London: The Warburg Institute. 1943. 183 pp. 18s.

Doubtless produced under considerable difficulties, this number of *Medieval and Renaissance Studies* includes, despite the dearth in scholarly activities brought about by war conditions, several important contributions to the history of learning between Boethius and Leibniz.¹ Dr Minio-Paluello contributes an important paper

¹ It was disappointing not to find here a continuation to Dom Wilmart's *Le Florilege Mixte de Thomas Bekynnton*, a first instalment of which appeared in the first number. It is hoped that

this was not due to loss of the MS. through enemy action, and that what remains to be printed will appear in due course.

on the Boethian version of Aristotle's *Categories*. Here we have a very scholarly piece of research, proving quite convincingly that a version so far ascribed to an unknown author is actually Boethius's translation, and that the Latin text attributed to him till now is partly a tenth-century work. The legend connected with the Rock of Parmenides forms the subject-matter of an interesting article by Dr Klibansky, who is also responsible for a paper on Plato's *Parmenides* during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. This is the kind of study one would like to see more often. For the history of the vicissitudes of an important classical text furnishes more light on intellectual history than might superficially appear. Perhaps the most controversial Platonic dialogue, the *Parmenides*, was only known indirectly during the Middle Ages through Chalcidius, Macrobius, and Aulus Gellius. Only after 1286, when William of Moerbeke turned Proclus's commentary on the *Parmenides* into Latin, did part of it become directly known; the complete text, however, only became available during the Renaissance, when it commanded the attention of several leading humanists. George of Trebizond translated it into Latin in 1450 or 1451 for Nicholas of Cusa, but this version only survives in a Volterra MS., from which Dr Klibansky prints the letter of dedication. A short but interesting biographical sketch of George of Trebizond is also included,¹ and the influence of the *Parmenides* on Nicholas of Cusa's thought is clearly established. Ficino's version and commentary on it, and the interest of Pico and the Medicean circle in it, are shown in their right perspective; later study of the dialogue is also accounted for down to Leibniz.

John the Scot's *Annotaciones in Marcianum* was published by Miss Cora E. Lutz in 1939. Miss L. Labowsky has found another version of this commentary in a Bodleian MS. to which she dedicates a note. This is followed by the first instalment of Dr R. W. Hunt's *Studies on Priscian in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*. He rightly complains that 'Little work has been done on the development of grammatical doctrine in the middle ages since the appearance of Thurot's *Notices et Extraits*', and points out that 'it is now becoming increasingly clear that if we neglect grammatical theory we are cutting ourselves off from an important source for understanding the thought of the eleventh and twelfth centuries'. It is with this in view that Dr Hunt discusses two anonymous commentaries on Priscian and Petrus Helias's *Summa super Priscianum*. He succeeds in establishing the relationship between these three texts and their significance, as well as Petrus Helias's dependence upon earlier grammarians. Quite rightly he emphasizes the dialectical side of these works, of which he publishes some extracts in appendix.

Addenda et Corrigenda to his edition of John of Salisbury's *Metalogicon* are contributed by Dr C. C. J. Webb, while the late Dr H. Kantorowicz and Miss Beryl Smalley throw new and important light on the beginnings of the Roman Law revival. Until now evidence connected with the mysterious 'Magister Pepo' was rather vague and uncertain. Thanks to a hitherto unnoticed passage in the unpublished *Moralia Regum* by Ralph Niger, a work written about 1180, in which is described the dawn of the legal Renaissance, the authors are able to confirm that it is to Pepo and not to Irnerius that the beginnings of this legal revival must be traced.² Lastly one should note Dr E. H. Kantorowicz's study on Guido Faba. Through an examination of Faba's *Rotā Nova*, of which he prints the prologue as an appendix, Dr Kantorowicz is able to draw much new evidence on Faba's biography, and correct some of Torraca's statements. A particularly felicitous

¹ To the works on George of Trebizond quoted one should add the important biographical sketch by R. Sabbadini in the *Enciclopedia Italiana* and now H. S. Wilson, 'George of Trebizond and Early Humanist Rhetoric', *Studies in Philology*, XL (1943), 367-79.

² One small point should be noted. At p. 238 the Italian form of the surname *Pedis Vaccae* is tentatively given as *Pie d'oca*. Actually it should be *Piedivacca*, a by no means uncommon name in medieval Italy.

elucidation of some Bolognese slang expressions enables him to add some hitherto unknown details about Faba's career, of which he furnishes an interesting and scholarly account.¹ In my review of the first number of this periodical I concluded: 'The high standard of scholarship and the importance of the subject-matter make one look forward to future issues.' Such an expectation has been amply fulfilled.

R. WEISS

LONDON

De Claris Mulieribus, translated by Henry Parker, Lord Morley; *Forty-Six Lives from Boccaccio*. Edited by H. G. WRIGHT. (Early English Text Society, No. 214.) London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press. 1943. cv+200 pp. 31s. 6d.

Professor Wright has made available, in this edition of Henry Parker, Lord Morley's translation of Boccaccio's *De Claris Mulieribus*, a work of considerable historical interest. Morley throughout his life touched Tudor interests at many points. As a boy he was in the household of the gracious and learned Margaret Beaufort, mother of Henry VII. Later he was an important figure at the court of Henry VIII, whom he accompanied to the Field of the Cloth of Gold, and who sent him on a mission to Germany at the time when pamphlet after pamphlet was pouring from Luther's pen. Towards the end of his life, he produced polemics against Romish error and superstition, remaining sufficiently Catholic at heart through changing times to retain the favour of Mary. Throughout this long and active career, he steered his way skilfully through the troubled waters of Tudor politics, dying at the age of eighty in 1556, a date established by Professor Wright in correction of the error repeated as late as W. C. Hazlitt's edition of this work in 1871 that he died in the latter end of Henry's reign.

Morley's translations are prompted rather by his desire to please his royal patrons than by literary or stylistic interest. He is remarkable among his contemporaries for the scholarship which enabled him to discard the usual French medium and use Latin and Italian sources direct. The present work, Professor Wright points out, is taken from the Latin text printed at Louvain by Egidius van der Heerstraten in 1487, not from the French rendering of Laurent de Premierfait. He is not anxious, however, to 'interprete and turne the Latine into Englyshe with as much grace of our vulgare tounge' as is Udall, Elyot or Grimald, nor does he use the discipline of translation to try the resources of the vernacular. The one motive he has in common with his more linguistically inclined contemporaries is that of national rivalry, explaining in the preface to one of his translations that he felt that he, 'beynge an Englyshe man, myght do aswell as the Frenche man'.

A comparison of Morley's English with the Latin, facilitated by the clear lay-out of the pages of this edition, shows that he concentrates more on the matter than

¹ Undoubtedly a lacuna in this otherwise admirable study is the passing over of Faba's contribution to the beginnings of Italian literary prose. This, which is in my view the most important side of Faba's achievement, has not yet been adequately studied despite the researches of Gaudenzi, Monaci, Torraca, and Schiaffini. In connexion with Faba's activities in the vernacular field, Dr Kantorowicz feels certain that the *Parlamenti* and *Epistole* are Faba's work. Personally, I do not feel quite so certain yet. Besides the Vatican MS. used by Gaudenzi for his edition, there are two MSS. of it still to be studied, MS. Nationale Bibliothek, Vienna, no.

585, and MS. British Museum, Add. 33,221, and these might shed further light on the question of authorship. Moreover, a comparison will have to be made between the language of this work and that of the other vernacular writings by Faba, such as the passages in the *Doctrina ad inveniendas, incipiendas, et formandas materias*, which was edited by Monaci. Such a comparison will certainly furnish additional evidence towards a solution of this problem. Here is a case in which the new statistical theory propounded in G. Udny Yule's *The Statistical Study of Literary Vocabulary* will no doubt also prove extremely valuable.

on the manner. The linking of sentences is often clumsy, the expansion of the Latin is sometimes felicitous, as in the cadence of 'She buylded many townes and cities and dyd many other notable actes, which the deuourynge time hath now put in obliuyon', the Latin of the last clause being merely 'vetustas absorbsit', but is usually wordy. The single adjectives of the Latin are too often rendered by two in the English and there are some Latin formations which are incongruous in the general simplicity of the vocabulary, such as 'lacrimable', 'viduate', 'orbate', 'rutyllant'. As stylist, Morley has little grace.

The subject-matter provides a gallery of the women who pass through medieval and Tudor literature, whose names were household words to scholars and groundlings alike. Here is Thisbe, a warning against the 'immoderate power' of the 'passione of Cupid', Helen, for whom the Greeks, 'gatherynge together a thowsande shyppes, sailed to Troy and besegyde the towne', Penthesilea, whose name comes trippingly from the tongue of Sir Toby Belch, Hecuba, 'a verey playne example of our wrecchidnes', and many others to serve as a warning, from Eve onwards, or to be an example to womanhood. For these stories, some told with more or less correct historical detail, others mythological, and many 'taken oute from the poetes', and for the interest of Professor Wright's accompanying information and comment, this should be counted a valuable addition to the Early English Text Society series.

ELIZABETH J. SWEETING

LONDON

Stephen Gosson, A Biographical and Critical Study. By WILLIAM RINGLER. Princeton: University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1942. vi+151 pp. 13s. 6d.

This study, arising out of a thesis completed in 1937, bears traces of confusion in arrangement: Chapter II, 'The Playwright and Pamphleteer', and Chapter IV, 'The Attack on the Stage', cover the same ground and should surely have been amalgamated. Full use of the biographical material available has been made and some new facts about Gosson's life are added. The popular view that Gosson was a puritan is exploded. Indeed, Dr Ringler shows (from an entry in the Pilgrim Book of the English Hospital at Rome noted by Professor Mark Eccles) that Gosson was a guest of the Jesuits in the spring of 1584. The suggestion that he went as a secret agent for Walsingham and that one of his commissions might have been to attend lectures in order to provide arguments for his old teacher, John Rainolds, to refute is fascinating—and not improbable in view of Dr Ringler's quotation from Daniel Featley's *The Life & Death of John Rainolds*.

The main part of this study of Gosson is rightly taken up with the stage controversy started by the work for which he is now chiefly remembered, *The Schoole of Abuse*. Dr Ringler follows the main lines of Sir Edmund Chambers's *Elizabethan Stage*, adding some new evidence from contemporary sources. Useful as this is for specialists on the Elizabethan stage, general students of literature will, I think, be more interested in Dr Ringler's convincing suggestion as to the original source for that still-born style 'euphuism'. According to Dr Ringler, who has collaborated in an edition and translation of Rainolds's *Oratio in Laudem Artis Poeticae*, Rainolds's teaching and stylistic practice in Latin were responsible for the euphuistic style which appeared simultaneously in John Lyly's *Euphues* and in Gosson's *The Schoole of Abuse* and *Ephemerides of Phialo*—the latter is the only contemporary work referred to directly by Lyly. Both Gosson and Lyly came from Canterbury and were students under Rainolds at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, during the same years, though there is no evidence that they were acquainted. Dr Ringler shows by quotation that in *The Schoole of Abuse* Gosson not only imitated his

master's method of accumulating examples from classical story and unnatural history, but he also borrowed his arguments. Gosson seems to have realized that this style was unsuitable for pamphlet warfare, for he dropped it in his later works.

Dr Ringler provides a full and detailed bibliography of Gosson's works. The attribution of *Pleasant Quippes for Vpstart Newfangled Gentlewomen* to Gosson is shown to rest on a Collier forgery. Dr Ringler has a plausible explanation of the inclusion of Stephen Gosson, who wrote no pastoral poetry, amongst the pastoral writers listed by Meres in 1598. Meres had confused Gosson who had written against the stage with Anthony Munday who had also written against the stage, and who was a writer of pastorals.

The thesis atmosphere is unfortunately preserved by the format of this book, which has been reproduced by photostat from the author's typescript. Those who are not discouraged by the forbidding appearance of the pages will reap their reward.

JEAN ROBERTSON

LONDON

Stolne and Surreptitious Copies: A Comparative Study of Shakespeare's Bad Quartos.

By ALFRED HART. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press; London: H. Milford. 1942. xiii + 478 pp. 12s. 6d.

Dr Hart's elaborate collections of objective evidence, his numerous statistical tables, and his close arguments from these data make his book rugged, but profitable, going. And the statistical prickly-pears frequently bloom with pleasant flowers of wit and genialities of style. The book has no romantic attractions: it offers no pretty theories, no finished structures of ingenious conjecture. Its aim is quite simple:

to prove that the six bad quartos [*Contention*, *True Tragedy*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Henry V*, *Merry Wives*, *Hamlet*] are derivative texts and take their origin from the corruption of the respective six plays written by Shakespeare. For the rest one may conjecture what he pleases. Whether Shakespeare used non-existent early plays as raw material for his own, how the reported plays came to the press, who were the pirates and reporters, and why such a well-managed company as the Chamberlain's men came to suffer the piracy of four popular plays within six years are, in comparison with the major problem of priority, matters of small importance. (p. ix.)

The solutions he proposes for one or two such riddles he does not press.

A tone of controversy (held at an impersonal level) runs throughout the book. There are two main points at issue, one concerning generally the derivation of all the bad quartos, the other concerning specifically the derivation of the *Contention* and the *True Tragedy*, whose admission to the dubious company of the bad quartos is still not universally accepted. Dr Hart believes all six bad quartos to be reports by actors of abridged versions of the full Shakespearean plays represented in the good texts, quarto or folio. He is constantly concerned to prove that the bad quartos cannot have been first drafts and to show the absurdity of supposing that Shakespeare made the countless small changes in expression and in metrics that a revision of them into the full and good texts would mean. He does not always keep distinct from the first-sketch theory another which he attacks, namely, the double-revision theory put forward by Professors Pollard and Wilson in a series of letters to *The Times Literary Supplement* in 1919. But Professors Pollard and Wilson never held that the bad quartos were anything but derivative texts, and, since all first-draft theories are now generally discredited among competent textual scholars, Dr Hart sometimes gives the impression of flogging a dead, or at any rate moribund, horse. Some of the evidence against first-sketch theories, however, can also be used against double-revision, a complicated theory impossible of proof and

not necessary to account for the facts. The merit of Dr Hart's evidence, on the positive side, is that it demonstrates the immediate dependence of all the corruption in the bad quartos, in sense or in metrics, on the corresponding good texts. This makes unnecessary the positing of any other text but Shakespeare's as the source of at least the corrupt portions of the bad quartos. But, although Dr Hart has a chapter on the non-Shakespearian lines of the bad quartos, he does not, it seems to me, face the problem quite squarely. He dismisses them all equally as 'born in corruption'. He does not sufficiently distinguish those passages of *Romeo and Juliet* and of *Hamlet*, occurring in the later part of each play, which are metrically correct and different in phrasing from the corresponding passages in the good texts. These may be no more than the efforts of the reporting actors to fill in the thinnest parts of their report; but at any rate such passages have to be reckoned with. Dr Hart appears not to have seen George Ian Duthie's new study of *Hamlet* for the Cambridge series of *Shakespeare Problems* (1941). Mr Duthie thinks Q_1 mainly derivative from Q_2 , but he takes full account of the inescapable complications introduced by *Der bestrafte Brudermord* and by the closer correspondence to the source of some of the non-Shakespearian passages in Q_1 . Perhaps Dr Hart's omission of *Der bestrafte Brudermord* is a deliberate result of his intention to press only a demonstrable argument and to leave out speculation on problems that must inevitably remain unsettled.

The other controversial matter in the book concerns the *Contention* and the *True Tragedy*. These are boldly classed with the four recognized bad quartos as being, beyond question, also entirely derivative from good Shakespearian texts. To this reviewer (admittedly prejudiced in favour of the argument) he has successfully and overwhelmingly made his case. He deals separately, in an appendix, with the possibility of Marlowe's authorship, or part authorship, of 2 and 3 *Henry VI*, and decides plausibly against it, on grounds primarily of vocabulary, verse, allusions and images, secondarily of character and dramatic technique. In both these matters (the relation of the folio texts to the quartos and the authorship of the plays), his arguments are directed against Professor Tucker Brooke's study of the *Henry VI* plays in the *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy* for 1912. He does not appear to know Professor Brooke's modification of his own early position in his review of Professor Alexander's *Shakespeare's Henry VI and Richard III.*¹

Dr Hart's method is simple. He takes as his starting-point Greene's *Orlando Furioso* (the basis for Dr Greg's classic study of the features that distinguish a memorial report from an authentic text) and throughout his examination of the Shakespearian texts uses it as a comparative control. His argument is based on the similarity of the disorders in the bad Shakespearian quartos to those found in the quarto of *Orlando Furioso* and on the similarity of the relation between the bad and good Shakespearian texts to that between the quarto of *Orlando* and the good text of *Orlando's* part preserved in manuscript. He compares the good and bad Shakespearian texts for length, vocabulary, plot and relation to source, verse structure, anticipated and recollected lines, borrowings from other plays and stage directions. The material is divided by topic rather than by play, so that every play is handled in every chapter. This has the advantage of stressing the similarity of the disorders in the bad quartos, especially in bringing the *Contention* and the *True Tragedy* into proper focus. It has the disadvantage of minimizing differences and of obscuring or over-simplifying the special problems of each text. Valuable as are the collections of data under topical headings, the dispersion of everything that relates to one particular play leaves the reader with no clear impression about each one. The book would have gained in clarity and in a juster emphasis if the findings about each quarto had been gathered together in summary form at the end, and if their differences had been made more explicit.

¹ *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, xxix (1930), 442-6.

These faults are minor beside the solid merits of the book. Many of the data Dr Hart collects in his comparison of the parallel texts are, so far as I know, entirely new and ask for the closest attention. I found most interesting and impressive his vocabulary tests. He has made a comparison of the common vocabularies in various pairs of texts. He finds that the percentage of words in common between a known source play and Shakespeare's derivative play (like the *Troublesome Reign* and *King John*) agrees closely with the percentage in common between two of Shakespeare's plays written in succession, or between any two plays; whereas the percentage of words in common between one of the bad quartos and its corresponding good text is very much greater. For instance, the *Troublesome Reign* has 50% of its vocabulary in common with *King John* (percentages based on the one of the pair having the smaller number of words); *King Lear* 57% in common with *King Lear*; 1 *Henry IV* 52% in common with 2 *Henry IV*; *Arden of Feversham* 53% in common with *Spanish Tragedy*; *Edward II* 57% in common with *Edward III*. But each of the bad quartos has in common with the good Shakespearean text from 86.5% (*Merry Wives*) to 93.3% (*True Tragedy*), leaving only from 6.7% to 13.5% of its vocabulary peculiar to itself. Results for rare and compound words are as striking as those for the vocabulary in general. Throughout all these tables, the *Contention* and the *True Tragedy* range themselves with the other bad quartos, not with source plays such as *King Lear* and the *Troublesome Reign*. I cannot do justice to the elaborate data he presents. They are worth examining, not merely by the textual critic, but by anyone interested in Shakespeare's vocabulary.

Other chapters that are especially informative are those on verse structure, in which, among other things, he shows that the distribution of irregular verse in *Romeo and Juliet* and *Hamlet* tells against the double-revision theory; and that on inter-play borrowings, in which he shows that at least eleven plays of about the same date and belonging to Pembroke's, the Admiral's, or Strange's men, are linked together in a network of lines and passages common to two or more plays. It is seen at once, therefore, that the presence in the Henry VI plays of lines echoing *Edward II* and the *Massacre of Paris* (itself corrupt) need not mean Marlovian authorship.

I find more controversial some of the arguments Dr Hart adduces for his theory of stage-cutting. That the shortening of the text in the bad quartos is due not solely to the reporting, but at least in part to abridgement for the stage, is plausible enough. For the reports must be of the plays as acted and therefore as they had been cut. It is also plausible to suppose that, in the cutting, long speeches, sententious passages, and poetical embroideries would suffer. But to deduce from this obvious dramatic necessity the apparently unqualified conclusion that the audience would not understand or want, and that the actors would dislike, 'sage reflections on life', classical allusions, 'excessive word-play', similes and 'elaborated comparisons' is not only unnecessary, but strange for anyone as fully steeped in the rhetoric of the Elizabethan drama as Dr Hart must be. There is a concealed circularity of argument throughout the chapter. The omission from *Richard III*, Q₁, of Elizabeth's farewell to the Tower he says 'illustrates the indifference, if not the active distaste, of the actors for poetry' (p. 139). On an omission from *Edmund Ironside* he comments: 'Figures of speech were rarely retained by the actors, certainly not three in eight lines' (p. 129). The implication in statements like these is the desperate one that most Elizabethan dramatists, including the popular Marlowe and Shakespeare, filled their plays with stuff neither actors would want to speak nor audiences to hear.

Dr Hart makes no distinction in the kind of cutting that might have been done for London and for provincial audiences; nor does he entertain the attractive possibility that the texts of some of the bad quartos, just as we have them, may have been put together by actors on tour expressly for country performance.

And is not his insistence on two hours as the limit of playing time too rigid? It is true (as he has demonstrated¹ and as Professor L. L. Schücking has shown independently²) that most Elizabethan and Jacobean plays (with the exception of Jonson's and two-thirds of Shakespeare's) conform to it, true also that most contemporary references give two hours as the normal playing time. But some do speak of two and a half or even three hours. These latter references and the length of Shakespeare's and of Jonson's plays are just as much facts as are the other references and the lengths of other plays. The folio text of *King Lear*, only some 200 lines shorter than the long quarto, has on it the indubitable marks of preparation for the stage. Dr Hart admits this, yet says it cannot be a stage version. On his own basis of computation, it could have been acted in two and a half hours. His handling of evidence for cutting is puzzling: he takes many of the omissions in both quarto and folio of seven pairs of good Shakespearian texts as evidence of what a stage-adaptor would cut, yet does not allow any of these texts to be stage-versions.

It is understandable that Dr Hart should omit *Pericles* from consideration, since there exists no good parallel text for comparison. But since Professor Alexander has made a claim for *The Taming of A Shrew* as derivative from Shakespeare's *Shrew*, though not a report in the sense of the other bad quartos, it would have been helpful to have it fully examined. The same is true of *Richard III* and of *King Lear*; the first quarto of the latter is one of the most puzzling and controversial of texts. One statement on p. 40 shows that Dr Hart regards it as sound, and he nowhere takes notice of the theory now gaining currency that it is a reported text. In the nature of the evidence, no study of these three texts can perhaps ever be as conclusive as Dr Hart's book on the six bad quartos. But I should like to see their vocabularies and their verse subjected to his exhaustive study.

MADELEINE DORAN

MADISON, WISCONSIN

The Merry Devil of Edmonston. Edited by WILLIAM AMOS ABRAMS. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press. 1942. x+290 pp. \$3.50.

The Merry Devil of Edmonston has been edited not infrequently, but this new edition is not at all a work of supererogation. In a lengthy introduction (pp. 3-103) Professor Abrams has much that is new to say about this light and diverting though imperfectly transmitted comedy.

His introduction treats of the bibliographical and stage history of the play, sources, date of composition, text, and authorship. Dr Abrams accepts Manly's contention that the source of the main plot is the chapter in *The Famous Historie of Fryer Bacon* entitled 'How Friar Bacon did helpe a young man to his Sweetheart, which Fryer Bungye would have married to another; and of the mirth that was at the wedding'. This derivation seems certain. Dr Abrams believes that Act IV, scene ii of *The Merry Devil* is based on a tale found in *The Shakespeare Jest-Books*—'Of the mylner that stale the nuttes of the taylor that stale a shepe'. W. C. Hazlitt first claimed a similarity between the two, but he did not regard the tale as a source of *The Merry Devil*, IV, ii, and no other editor before Dr Abrams has seen similarity at all. Dr Abrams, printing side by side extracts from the tale and from the play, succeeds in my opinion in showing a connexion between them despite differences.

There is only one substantive edition of *The Merry Devil*—Q₁, 1608. Dr Abrams surveys the later quartos and determines the copy-text of each: and he appraises

¹ In three articles on the length of Elizabethan and Jacobean plays in *Rev. of Eng. Stud.* VIII (1932), 139-54, 395-413; x (1934), 1-28; reprinted in *Shakespeare and the Homilies* (Melbourne and London, 1934).

² *Zum Problem der Überlieferung des Hamlet-Textes* (Leipzig, 1931).

the work of his predecessors in the editorial field. He bases his own text on the Folger Shakespeare Library copy of Q_1 , but his is an eclectic text: he accepts various conjectural emendations from later quartos and from other editors, and he includes some of his own. The Q_1 text is certainly, as Dr Abrams shows, both corrupt and abridged. Among other possibilities he says that the quarto 'may have been issued surreptitiously and may have been printed from a discarded version—perhaps a traveling prompt copy—abridged for use on a provincial tour'. He goes on: 'what may have happened, and it seems as likely to be correct as any other supposition, is this: at some time prior to July 10, 1606 [when the King's Men went on a tour], traveling versions of the more popular plays belonging to the King's Company were prepared. *The Merry Devil* was among these popular plays. [After the company's return to London] some more or less unprincipled actor, or actors, may have secured the old traveling version without the knowledge of the entire company, patched it up as occasion offered, and finally sold it to Arthur Johnson.' Thus Dr Abrams implies for *The Merry Devil* the same kind of transmission as Pollard and Dover Wilson suggested in 1918 for the Shakespearian bad quarto texts. The phrase 'patched it up as occasion offered' is rather vague: Dr Abrams does not say that the patching up was done by memory—it may have been; but he does imply that at least portions of the extant text (those which stood in the manuscript of the provincial abridgement before the patching up was done) are descended from the author by transcription, though with cuts.

The play has been variously attributed to Shakespeare, Brewer, Drayton, Heywood. Dr Abrams examines these attributions and gives objections to them made by himself and others. He regards the play as the work of Dekker. This theory has been advanced before, but it has never been argued for in such detail as we have here. Dr Abrams lists various stylistic features of *The Merry Devil* and shows that they are extensively paralleled in the works of Dekker. He deals with details of vocabulary, imagery, and metre, with punning, alliteration, and repetition, with plot-construction, characterization, and atmosphere. If the extant text was in part memorially transmitted, one must be careful in drawing conclusions as to authorship from such evidence as phraseological parallels with passages in other plays. Reminiscences of other plays are not infrequently found in reported texts. Again, Dr Abrams draws attention to phrases repeated in different passages in *The Merry Devil* and notes that such repetition is characteristic of Dekker: but it is also characteristic of memorial reconstructors. Even if *The Merry Devil* is not in part a reported text it is curtailed and mangled, it is not in the state in which the author left it, and one must still be careful. Dr Abrams realizes this. His conclusion as to the authorship of the play depends, as he says, upon internal evidence, and 'the apparent errors and obvious abridgements in the text are such as to make inconclusive any argument based solely upon internal grounds'. It must be said that some of the points of style in *The Merry Devil* which Dr Abrams parallels in Dekker are not peculiar to that dramatist—e.g. direct appeal to the imagination of the audience, iteration (as in 'Good, good, tis well', 'Goe to, goe to', 'I, doe, do'), frequent punning, music imagery: and some of his evidence from verbal parallelism is not so convincing as the rest. But, after all this has been taken into account, the fact remains that Dr Abrams has certainly shown that the play is redolent of Dekker. If it is not an abridgement of a play by Dekker (perhaps reported in part or even in whole), it is the work of someone steeped in Dekker.

Dr Abrams is cautious in dating the composition of the play. He gives a useful summary of previous opinions; and, after his own arguments, tentatively suggests a date between 1601 and 17 May 1603. This suggestion depends to some extent on his view of the authorship of the play.

Dr Abrams considers the relationship between the play and the prose pamphlet, *The Life and Death of the Merry Devil of Edmonton*, by Anthony Brewer. This

pamphlet is based partly on a fuller state of the play than the extant version presents. Editors before Dr Abrams have noted that the pamphlet helps to make clearer some of the confusion in the sub-plot of the extant version of the play, confusion which is the result of the abridgement. Thus it helps to make clearer the episode in which Smug pretends to be St George. But Dr Abrams is the first to claim that the pamphlet preserves two other episodes from the unabridged play. The first of these concerns experiences of the poachers in the forest during the first night of the action, in the course of which Smug, frightened by the appearance in the forest of the nuns of Cheston, climbs a tree and finishes by falling out of it. There are, as Dr Abrams shows, unmistakable references in the abridged play indicating that such an episode must have formed part of the full play. Dr Abrams is on firm ground here—somewhat more so, I think, than in the second case, which concerns the singing of a catch.

Dr Abrams gives full textual notes and useful and interesting explanatory notes. As appendices he prints the Brewer pamphlet and the extract from *The Shakespeare Jest-Books* already referred to. And he gives a Selected Bibliography. He is to be congratulated on this edition, which should be valuable to all students of Elizabethan drama, and which is characterized by both imagination and diligence.

G. I. DUTHIE

BRISTOL

John Donne Since 1900. A Bibliography of Periodical Articles. By WILLIAM WHITE. Boston: F. W. Faxon. 1942. vi+26 pp.

This bibliography, the preface to which implies that it is a reprint in separate form, is intended to make reasonably complete the twentieth-century portion of the biographical and critical sections of Mr Geoffrey Keynes's *Bibliography*. Mr White does not entirely limit his range to the twentieth century: he includes 'fifteen items dated before 1900...selected for their especial merit'. Some of these items invite consultation: Leslie Stephen promises to be interesting, and Mr White's summary of an essay by Dowden shows sounder views than those of most twentieth-century writers on Donne (whatever we may think of the list of the 'tendencies'): Dowden, we are told,

disclaims him as the founder of the 'metaphysical school' by the statement that Donne merely yielded with more abandon to the tendencies of the time—subtleties of thought, over-ingenuous fantasies, far-fetched imagery, and not always felicitous curiosity.

Mr White's method is to mix two methods: those of the catalogue and of the *catalogue raisonné*. We are grateful for the summaries appended to certain of his entries, and I think that, without much more trouble to himself, he could have made this method the rule. For Mr White appears to have read what he lists: for example, he honours with quotation those writers who have assigned reasons for Donne's remarkable twentieth-century popularity. And it would surely have taken little more effort to expand such entries as the following to the point where they indicate not only where information exists and what sort of information it is that exists there, but also what precisely the information is:

Wilson, F. P., 'Notes on the Early Life of John Donne', *RES*, III (July, 1927) 272-279.
Information from records at London Guildhall on Donne's patrimony, the date of his birth, his stepfather, and the date of his travels—contrary to Walton's *Life*. Cf. *N. & Q.* CLIII (1927) 56.

It was an excellent idea to leave alternate pages blank for the reader's addenda or notes.

I have noticed only two omissions: (1) *The Commonplace Book of Arthur Capell* (*Mod. Lang. Review*, Oct. 1932) discusses Capell's versions of the thirteen poems

by Donne which he transcribes; and (2) the identification of the Olcon of Drayton's *Sirena* with Donne (pp. 5 and 7) might have been followed by a reference to the probably more correct identification of him with James I (see *Times Lit. Supp.* 27 Nov. 1937).

And I have noted the following misprints: p. 5a, for '*Littell's Living Age*' read '*... Age*'; p. 11a, for '*Perjorative*' read '*Pejorative*'; p. 17b, for '*Ivvenilia*' read '*Iuuenilia*'; and p. 23b, for '*C. S. Lewin*' read '*C. S. Lewis*'. On p. 19a there is a further instance of the way Sir Edmund Gosse has suffered for his surname. On 20 July 1917 we find him writing to Robert Ross:

I am grieved that Mr. Tonks invariably mis-spells my name!...it saps one's sense of individuality. But Goose is worse. (*Life and Letters of Sir Edmund Gosse*, by Evan Charteris, 1931, p. 414.)

I recall an errata slip in an American book on Ruskin which acknowledged the worse error, and Mr White has let it slip in once more.

GEOFFREY TILLOTSON

LONDON

The Dunciad. By ALEXANDER POPE. Edited by JAMES SUTHERLAND. (The Twickenham Edition, Vol. v.) London: Methuen. 1943. lvi+476 pp. 30s.

This fifth volume of the Twickenham edition of Pope is the third to appear in print, following Mr Tillotson's edition of *The Rape of the Lock* and Mr Butt's of the *Imitations of Horace*, the *Epistle to Dr Arbuthnot* and the *Epilogue to the Satires*. Like his predecessors, Professor Sutherland has in mind the twentieth-century reader who is willing to take a little trouble to understand the 'ideal' reader of the eighteenth century who 'would respond to the *Dunciad* with the immediate awareness of a contemporary and the discrimination natural to one of the initiated'. He provides therefore an Introduction which deals with the history of the *Dunciad's* appearances in its different forms, the provocations under which Pope first wrote it and the revisions which he subsequently made. As he shows, the beginnings of the poem may probably be traced to a date earlier by several years than 1726, and if so, Theobald was not the original hero, important as his *Shakespeare Restored* was in later developments. The action of the *Dunciad* is given the specific date of Lord Mayor's Day 1719, and Professor Sutherland accepts Professor Sherburn's conjecture that it originated in a kind of following of *MacFlecknoe*, a poem on the choice of a city poet, in burlesque of the recent choice of a laureate in December 1718; and that, after Settle's death in 1724 and the omission to appoint a city poet in succession to him, Pope, encouraged by Swift, decided not to waste the labour already spent, and recast his work. As Professor Sutherland summarizes the matter, 'At one stroke, Theobald was to supply the poet with a hero for his poem, and the editor of Shakespeare with the sort of revenge that he was best fitted to take. The poem, which had originally been a satire on dull poets, would now satirize dull critics as well.' It grew too large to be included in the third volume of the *Miscellanies* in 1727, and instead appeared the prose *Peri Bathous: Or the Art of Sinking in Poetry*, which 'was to serve as a sort of ground-bait for the subsequent sport of the *Dunciad*. Pope was counting on a bitter reply from the various authors whom he had provoked in this treatise; and then, after a suitable interval had elapsed, he could publish his poem.' On the tangled history of the publication of the first edition, the manner of publication and Pope's motives for anonymity, on the further tangled history of the *Dunciad Variorum*, the assistance received from Savage and Pope's own main hand in it, on the *New Dunciad* of 1741—on all this mystification Professor Sutherland sheds light in the first three

sections of his Introduction. In the fourth he defends with good arguments the substitution of Colley Cibber for Theobald in the completely revised *Dunciad* of 1743; and in the fifth he notes the effective burlesque use of the Ancients, the obligations to Dryden and more recent satirists of dullness, the precedents for the facetious commentary and its biographical value, and finally he discusses the poem as a poem, as a work of art by an artist jealous for his art. There follow, as in the other volumes of the series, a Chronological Table and a list of Abbreviations, and then the *Dunciad Variorum* of 1729, preceded by a Note on the Text, and the *Dunciad in Four Books* of 1743, again preceded by a Note on the Text. A Biographical Appendix on the Dunces and an Index complete the volume. With all this, with Pope's commentary and the editor's own corrections and additions, the 'ideal' reader of the twentieth century is well equipped for study and delight.

EDITH C. BATHO

LONDON

The Forgotten Hume: Le Bon David. By ERNEST CAMPBELL MOSSNER. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1943. xvi+252 pp. 20s.

Boswell was not the only observer to be puzzled by the union in David Hume of uncompromising scepticism in religious matters with outstanding personal integrity and benevolence. The greatest of the *philosophes* was genial and warmhearted in friendship, and his intimate associates were clergymen of a doctrinally severe Kirk. Hume, there is no doubt, interested his contemporaries partly because he raised acutely and in his own person the question (so insistent since the 1730's) of the good pagan, uninspired morality, the 'rule of right'. On the one hand he was 'the infidel Hume', on the other *le bon David*.

In a letter of 1766 Hume makes in his own case the familiar eighteenth-century distinction (reflected in the pattern of literary biographies till Sainte-Beuve) between writings and the writer's character. This justifies Professor Mossner in attempting a separate estimate of Hume the man as a preliminary to a study of the philosopher. His method is to set out fully Hume's relations with various other men of letters, and so to give solidity both to the central figure and to the background. Old calumnies are refuted by new facts and by the new perspective in which others are set. Especially valuable is the vindication of Hume's dealings with his 'pupil' Rousseau, whose brooding sensitiveness turned great benefits into fantastic injuries and threatened his benefactor's good name. It is tempting to see the Rousseau affair as symptomatic of a larger conflict then in progress: Hume himself detected in it the opposition of sense and sensibility.

Hume's central position in the Scottish literary world of his day has never been made so plain. Professor Mossner describes him as the 'catalyst' of the Scottish Enlightenment. The Edinburgh of Dr Carlyle, Adam Smith, Blair, Ferguson and the others was self-conscious in its intellectual rivalry with London, and Hume with his international reputation for taste and judgement was a useful guide and supporter to his young fellow-countrymen. Thomas Blacklock 'the Scottish Pindar', John Home 'the Scottish Shakespeare' (whose *Agis* and *Douglas* Garrick had rejected), 'the Scottish Homers' Wilkie and Macpherson, are products of the classical ambitions which animated the Select Society of Edinburgh and the movement for punctilious correctness in language. 'Ossian' in particular gains from this context a significance obscured by association with a Celtic revival and controversies over authenticity. One point which emerges incidentally from Dr Mossner's account (there is ample evidence elsewhere) is the extent to which reviewing took the form of puff-writing (even by the author concerned) in the

eighteenth century. It is not always safe to treat even the volumes of criticism as disinterested.

Professor Mossner's book is a useful reminder that what the text-books deal with in terms of 'tendencies' and 'reactions' takes place in individual human terms; and the student of the literature of the age of Johnson and Hume (the two focal points) must especially concern himself with persons. Attractiveness is here, in general, combined successfully with accuracy; but it is odd to find England's oldest alliance described as 'recent' in the 1760's (p. 39).

J. C. BRYCE

GLASGOW

The Later Career of Tobias Smollett. By LOUIS L. MARTZ. (*Yale Studies in English*, Volume 97.) New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1942. xiv+214 pp. 18s. 6d.

The importance of Dr Martz's book goes in several ways considerably beyond its narrow subject. The approach is critical rather than biographical: Smollett's forgotten activities in Grub Street are made to throw new light on his maturest work. In 1753 (the opening date chosen) Smollett undertook to prepare *A Compendium of Authentic and Entertaining Voyages*, and for the next fifteen years he was a diligent compiler, from many scattered sources, of similar collections. Much historical and geographical detail in the later creative works comes immediately from these sources, even the *Travels through France and Italy* being a conflation of such material with Smollett's own observations: a practice which warns us that an eighteenth-century reader's smile at Parson Adams' bookish 'travels' was not quite as simple as ours. Much of the Scottish section of *Humphry Clinker*, till now associated with Smollett's Scottish visit in 1766, appeared in *The Present State of all Nations*, and goes back in part to a previous visit which, on the evidence of a letter made available since Dr Martz wrote, took place in 1753. This letter foreshadows, incidentally, the satiric attitude adopted towards England in the novel.

The larger implications of this research concern first the novelists' use of travel as a technical device in plot-making. Dr Martz tends to ignore the two traditions which here lie behind Smollett. It is certain that but for the quixotic-picaresque models used by Fielding, and by Smollett in his early novels (with the highway and the inn as structural elements), and the 'philosophical voyages' with which *The Adventures of an Atom* has some kinship, travel could not have entered to play its startlingly new role in *Humphry Clinker*. The direction of contemporary interest can be traced in Smollett's handling of the materials for his compilations. The marvels and adventures loved by seventeenth-century travellers are excised in favour of observation of men and manners and notes on history and science. It is the age of the Grand Tour, of travel as a humane education, an exploration, not of the remote but of the ordinary. In his own *Travels* Smollett's antiquarian comments are attempts to picture the whole ancient way of life. While he was in Italy the resumed excavations at Herculaneum and the publication of their results by the Accademia Reale had already begun to encourage the new historical approach earlier suggested by Vico in *La Scienza Nuova*.

Dr Martz has done well to draw attention to a large neglected field in eighteenth-century literature. 'Booksellers' work', though despised by writers, not only accounted for much of their energy, but is in its quality typical of the period. Lexicographers, encyclopaedists, makers of biographical dictionaries, 'historians' of every kind, were engaged in imposing upon the whole body of amassed knowledge that order which their century found at the heart of the universe. It is here that the impulse to close scrutiny and portrayal of men and nature, which we think of as looking forward to the work of the succeeding generation, begins. Further,

as this book shows in the case of Smollett, the best hack-writers brought to their task an exacting literary conscience. Dr Martz's attempt to relate the business of scientific synthesis with the rise of a weighty and balanced prose leads to some good remarks on style—though these are vitiated by failure to take into account the native basis of Smollett's language. It is dangerous to theorize about Latinism and rhetorical diction without remembering that this is a Scotsman's normal speech; and even Smollett's progress as a stylist is not unconnected with the ideals of the Edinburgh circle, one product of which was the rebirth of rhetoric as a living discipline in the Universities.

J. C. BRYCE

GLASGOW

Wordsworth's Formative Years. By GEORGE WILBUR MEYER. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1943. viii + 268 pp. \$3.50.

Mr George W. Meyer has planned a series of volumes intended to reinterpret all Wordsworth's work, and in this, the first, he examines, not, as most critics do, *The Prelude*, but the poetry and prose which Wordsworth wrote in the first twenty-eight years of his life. Mr Meyer regards these as, after all, the best evidence of the growth of Wordsworth's philosophical and artistic power and, indeed, considers *The Prelude* an 'inaccurate, romanticized version of Wordsworth's youth', a statement which perhaps goes too far. For though it may be arguable—and Wordsworth's guardians would pretty certainly have agreed, if the diagnosis had been explained to them—that Wordsworth was between 1787 and 1795 'a rather unengaging victim of what modern psychologists would probably describe as maladjustment and emotional immaturity', there still remains an essential truth in his own later description of his youth; and the fact that the dawn of memorable pomp in the summer of 1788 acquired heightened significance in his later recollection does not necessarily indicate that he deceived himself about it. Events and emotions usually display their full significance later, sometimes much later, than the immediate moment. Moreover, the Wordsworth who was not 'maladjusted' and who 'accepted his responsibilities' like a sensible and well-balanced young man was Christopher, not William—not the passionate poet over whom his mother felt deep anxiety in his childhood, and whose storms, even in the comparative and hard-won serenity of his old age, still shook the house. Though he may have been an egoist (a word of ambiguous meaning), his growing belief in an overruling and guiding Providence was not necessarily a proof of egoism. His Providence was not the same as Peer Gynt's.

When that is said, it is still no more than fair to say that Mr Meyer is undoubtedly right in emphasizing the importance of the strictly contemporary evidence for those 'formative years' in which Wordsworth made 'a long and painful effort to adjust unruly emotions and presuppositions to a world which he found to be more hostile than friendly'. Mr Meyer considers accordingly the relation of Wordsworth's early poems, letters and prose writings to his actual experience of life, giving a particularly fresh and interesting discussion of the *Letter to the Bishop of Llandaff* and *The Borderers*, and ending with a chapter entitled 'The Naturalism of 1798' which is clearly preparatory to his second volume. If this shows as much honesty, independence of judgment and clarity of expression as the first, it will be worth reading.

EDITH C. BATHO

LONDON

Thomas De Quincey's Theory of Literature. By SIGMUND K. PROCTOR. (*University of Michigan Publications, Language and Literature*, Vol. XIX.) Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1943. viii + 313 pp. \$3.50.

This monograph is an enlarged and revised version of a doctorate dissertation presented by the author a year before his death in 1938. The enlargements and revisions have been undertaken, to conform as far as possible with his known intentions, by Professors C. D. Thorpe and Paul Mueschke. Professor Thorpe has further added an appendix summarizing material published since 1935, which serves to show that during the last few years the work of De Quincey has engaged more attention than at any time since his death in 1859. The reason for this is not difficult to discover. De Quincey's attitude to literature and the other arts is dominated by an instinct towards self-analysis and for probing the recesses of human consciousness which would naturally attract interest to-day; and his critical theories, though presented in too desultory and discursive a manner to form a coherent system, are sufficiently distinctive to deserve full-length study. The key to these principles, in Proctor's view, is provided in De Quincey's pronouncements upon 'Literature as Power' and upon 'Rhetoric', which accordingly form the subjects of his two principal chapters, others being devoted to De Quincey's philosophical background, his general aesthetic and his views on style. The two passages setting forth the famous distinction between books of 'Power' and books of 'Knowledge' in *Letters to a Young Man* (1823) and *The Poetry of Pope* (1848) show some inconsistency, the former classing as 'anti-literature' books subsequently admitted as 'Literature of knowledge', while 'Power', or the awakening and organizing of emotion, is used first in a psychological and later in an ethical sense. De Quincey's reliance upon feeling rather than understanding as the agency of truth reveals itself in many of his most characteristic passages, as notably in the essay 'On the knocking on the gate in *Macbeth*'. At the same time his critical writings as a whole, particularly his comments upon earlier philosophers, show a deep strain of intellectualism, the two sides of his nature bespeaking 'both an intellectual and a mystic', keenly responsive to the lure of discursive reasoning yet profoundly affected by personal intuition concerning other spheres of consciousness such as the sense of holiness and sin. The dualism arising from the interaction of intellect and feeling has also influenced his treatment of rhetoric as the art of persuading by means of verbal manipulation.

Much careful and constructive research has gone to the making of this book which, taken as a whole, presents a fair and balanced estimate of De Quincey's critical theories—no easy task in the case of so uneven and temperamental a writer. If anything, Proctor is too detached and impartial, barely doing justice to the great purple patches and startling fantasies which, even in the sphere of criticism, are worth volumes of theorizing. He also tends to underrate De Quincey's originality, for instance in connexion with the idea of 'Literature as Power' which, while owing something to Wordsworth and Coleridge, bears wider implications of its own. More space might have been devoted to De Quincey's personality as affecting his theories and to his place in modern European criticism. Despite these limitations, which might have been made good had the author lived to complete his work, the dissertation as it stands represents a substantial contribution to scholarship upon a subject which hitherto has not been adequately treated.

B. E. C. DAVIS

LONDON

A Sheaf of Studies. By E. K. CHAMBERS. London: Oxford University Press. 1942. viii+158 pp. 10s.

A list of those works of Sir Edmund Chambers which have appeared with the Oxford imprint occupies the whole of the last 'page' of the dust-cover of this last addition. The list is incomplete as a bibliography since Sir Edmund has not always published with that press. But with what Ozymandian assurance it announces, simply by naming them, the permanence of its major items. The author of the eight volumes on Shakespeare and on the medieval and the Elizabethan stage is represented in this thinner volume mainly in *Matthew Arnold's Tree* (1941), an essay offered 'for what it is worth', and in *Some Dates in Coleridge's Annus Mirabilis* (1933, 1935). Those eight volumes and these two essays from the present volume represent the best Sir Edmund: no one surpasses him in the art of setting out all the available evidence judiciously, clearly and with a supererogatory grace. Those two essays apart, this volume shows Sir Edmund as a critic of literature (mainly as a critic of English poetry) and as a prose poet.

As critic he derives from Arnold. This derivation is particularly clear in his essay on *The Study of English Literature* (1896), the title of which suggests Arnold's *The Study of Poetry*, and the body of which owes most of its judgments to Arnold and much also of its terminology (a terminology which Arnold himself owed almost wholly to Newman). For instance, on pp. 106 f. we find:

...a talisman, or touchstone of literary merit...the secret of their greatness...steadying...this faculty of seeing things as they really are...its own characteristic notes, its own atmosphere, as it were, or perfume....

Sir Edmund admittedly shares Arnold's preoccupation with 'the best that has been known and thought in the world'; and he shares also Arnold's sense of how the alphas and betas fall: glorious Chaucer, glorious Shakespeare, glorious Milton, a gap of prose, glorious Wordsworth. But there is one point at which Sir Edmund breaks away, and gets well ahead of Arnold: while he counsels us, as Arnold did, 'to correct the errors of the historical point of view', he has come to know, as Arnold never did, that, even for the critic intent on 'the best', a sense of the historical is indispensable. So that we get such a passage as the following:

...no writer, however great, stands absolutely alone; each is the child of his own age, and the brother of his own people; nor is a complete understanding of any man's work possible, without some knowledge of the conditions under which it had its being, of the influences which helped to shape its form and inspire its purpose. This is an universal law. Wordsworth, indeed, says of Milton, 'Thy soul was like a Star, and dwelt apart'; and in a sense this is true.... But it is not true if it is taken to mean that Milton...lived a life which was out of all relation to the common life of his own countrymen in his own day...[the poets'] keenest vision cannot pierce far beyond the possibilities of existing knowledge, nor their highest aspirations soar a pitch out of all reach of existing ideals: the spiritual interests of those around them, purified and widened, it may be, in scope, but still essentially the same, are theirs also, and in their noblest utterances they do but give fuller and more conscious expression to the very ideas which, in forms crude and ill-defined, sway the contemporary masses.... (pp. 101 f.)

This passage shows a notable advance on Arnold and on nineteenth-century critics generally. Otherwise Sir Edmund stands with them.

And he stands with nineteenth-century writers, also, in the kind of prose-poetry he writes, of which these essays afford several instances. It is rather like the Greek of Lang, Leaf and Myers, and it is also rather like the medieval of William Morris. Writing in 1897, he employs the phrase, the 'incommunicable secret'; and writing in 1941, he employs it again; he has probably employed it several other times during the intervening years which are not represented by essays in this book: and this repeated phrase exemplifies the kind of effect which

Sir Edmund likes to find in poetry and likes to produce, when the chance offers, in his own prose, an effect of hieratic, dim magniloquence, of 'shadowy' arcanal grandeur. Or there is the word *quest*, of which he is also fond, a word sweet with all the medievalism of the nineteenth century. Sir Edmund's sense of the beautiful seems too noble, or, rather, too readily and derivatively noble. His sense of nobility gets in the way of his criticism. When he has invested his page with it, he considers his function as a critic to be fulfilled. His work as a critic, therefore, lacks the closeness and happy usefulness of his work as a researcher. His criticism is too descriptive. And he is too apt to make lists: having spotted Arnold's fondness for the moon, he does little more than quote the beautiful lines which attest that fondness; having discovered that Helen of Troy makes frequent and notable entrances into English poetry, he does little more than quote the beautiful lines in which those entrances are made. And his sense of the nineteenth-century noble gets in the way of his appreciation of modern English poetry (such as *Sweeney among the Nightingales*, which makes Sir Edmund 'squirm'). There is no reason at all why Sir Edmund should appreciate modern poetry. But the critic who decries it and who also writes the following sentence shows that he does not know enough about it to express a useful opinion:

[Those who have theorised about modern poetry] are well discussed in Sir Henry Newbolt's *A New Study of English Poetry* (1919) and again later in Mr. John Sparrow's *Sense and Poetry* (1934) (p. 121).

Why should the author of the remarkable books listed on the dust-cover trouble to speak about a subject on which he knows so little when there are so many on which he knows so much?

One word about Sir Edmund's wit. It usually takes the form of a dry minimum statement which sets the reader a small task in arithmetic. For instance:

I have read a book about [Arnold], the writer of which appears to have taken his inspiration from the insolent grace of Mr. Lytton Strachey, and to have succeeded admirably in catching the insolence.

So much for Mr Hugh Kingsmill. Or there is this:

The same pundit tells us that the first two anthologies called *Poems of To-day...* 'hardly contain five good poems between them'. I wish he had named the four exceptions.

So much for Mr Leavis.

GEOFFREY TILLOTSON

LONDON

The Origin of the Grail Legend. By ARTHUR C. L. BROWN. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1943. ix+476 pp. 28s.

It is impossible in the space at my disposal to do justice to the vast amount of learning in this important book. Professor Brown, whose work on *Yvain* established his reputation thirty years ago, now seeks to prove the Celtic and pagan origin of Chrétien's material in *Perceval*, in which, by general consent, are found the first traces of what appeared in later romance as the Holy Grail, the legendary talisman of Christian chivalry. It might be thought that the author is pushing at an open door because, to all who are competent to judge (that is, to all those who have something more than a second-hand knowledge of the Celtic world), the origin of the legend is obviously what the documents themselves claim it to be, namely a redaction in French of Brythonic material, whether British or Armorican. It is important, however, that scholars of Professor Brown's competence should collect and collate the overwhelming mass of proof, because of the incurable sense of

inferiority of British and American scholars when they are confronted with the pretensions of Germanic thesis-mongers. This lamentable weakness is nowhere better exemplified than in Bruce's *Evolution of Arthurian Romance*.

Now critics of a work such as this nearly always fall into the error of supposing that, if they disprove some of the confirmatory detail amassed by the author, they have effectually destroyed his main thesis, and I have no doubt that many of Professor Brown's critics will find great joy in showing up his more obvious mistakes. I wish to anticipate such a misjudgment by stating my opinion that the author has performed a notable service to the study of Arthurian origins and that his general conclusions may be regarded as firmly established. Of his more speculative points, his identification of Nodens (Nudd, Nuada) as the prototype of the Fisher King is particularly interesting.

I mentioned just now a common error of critics. No less unfortunate is the corresponding habit of Arthurian scholars of heaping upon their well-founded and sturdily built edifice of proof any odds and ends which they may find by the wayside, a great part of which is worthless, especially if the writer is not expert in the Celtic languages. I regret to say that Professor Brown's great work is littered with such stuff, and I have not the space to deal adequately with it here. He will persist in translating *Lloegr* and *Logres* (England) as 'Britain' and in resting part of his thesis on his mistranslation; he often misunderstands the Celtic texts (probably on account of faulty translations), and when he attempts to give philological explanations of names—well, the less said about that, the better. One example will suffice. *Caswallawn*, one of the quasi-historical names for which we do happen to have a well-authenticated British original, *Cassibellannus* or *Cassivellaunus*, is explained as 'made up of *cas* "hateful" + Galam. It is... an epithet for the castle of the dead.' To any Celtic scholar this is just a 'howler', and it is particularly unfortunate since it may be argued that *Caswallawn* in *Branwen* is one of the few clear examples of borrowing from Geoffrey of Monmouth. I suppose that such forms as *Greidaw* (for *Greidawl*), *Sande* (for *Sandde*), *Mofran* (for *Morfran*) are misprints, but *Manawyddan* for *Manawydan* is due to unacquaintance with modern Welsh scholarship.

I would urge two considerations on all non-Celtic researchers into Arthurian origins—first that the Irish material is only analogical and confirmatory; it cannot be treated as 'origins'. Most of the Brythonic myth and folk-lore is co-ordinate with and not derived from Goidelic, and it is essential to recognize the difference between what is purely British, e.g. the Pryderi saga with its native names of *Rhiannon*, *Teyrnon*, *Pryderi*, *Modron*, *Mabon*, etc., and those tales which were developed among the descendants of Irish-speaking tribes in Wales, such as the *Llew* saga and *Branwen*; and, secondly, that any conclusion based on the Mabinogion or similar tales in their present form is absolutely worthless without a preliminary investigation into the development of that form.

In spite, however, of these criticisms, and in spite of his misapprehensions, Professor Brown has, in my opinion, made it impossible for such follies as those of Förster and the German school to be seriously regarded in the future.

W. J. GRUFFYDD

CARDIFF

Slavonic Studies—Sixteen Essays in Honour of George Rapall Noyes. Ed. by ALEXANDER KAUN and E. J. SIMMONS. Ithaca: Cornell University Press; London: H. Milford. 1943. x+242 pp. 18s. 6d.

This volume, for which Sir Bernard Pares has written a fitting Foreword, contains first a tribute by the late Professor S. N. Harper of Chicago, and then a series of studies by American scholars dealing with a wide range of subjects. The main field

is Russian, though Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia have their place. At the end we have a short account of Professor Noyes's career, and a bibliography of his publications—books, papers, notes and reviews, and translations. The dimensions of this latter are astounding, and reveal not only the breadth and diversity of the scholar's interests, but also the quality of his achievement.

Almost every essay is of independent value, many of them are replete with translations serving to illustrate the writers' views. But one should take them as a whole in order to get the complete picture. Professor Coleman gives us a picture of the Mickiewicz of the Crimean Sonnets, whose romantic passion provoked so much comment among his older compatriots. We have an interesting study of religious folk-lore in Lithuania based on native and outside sources (chiefly German and Polish). There is a paper by Dr René Wellek on the two traditions in Czech literature. We have one of the lyrics of Jakšić in the version of Professor Elton, and—the body of the book—a series of papers on nineteenth-century Russians.

Professor Wacław Lednicki, in his extremely interesting notes entitled 'Mickiewicz, Dostoevski and Blok', draws partly upon his fascinating 'Moj Puszkowski *Table Talk*' published in 1937 in the monumental anniversary Polish tribute to Pushkin (*Puszkini*, 1837–1937, Tom. I, Krakow, 1939). Professor Lednicki seems to be the first to draw attention to the importance of the Polish theme in Alexander Blok's unfinished but remarkable poem *Vozmezdnie* (*Revenge* or *Retaliation*). It is a pity that Lednicki deals so briefly with this interesting subject (the greater part of his essay deals with the Mickiewicz or rather 'anti-Mickiewicz' echoes in Dostoevsky). Those, however, especially among the Poles, whom Lednicki's theme will interest will find a detailed analysis of Blok's 'Polish poem' in two articles which appeared this year in a new Russian publication in New York (*Novy Zhurnal*, Nos. 2 and 3). Of the purely Russian articles two are devoted to Lermontov, the centenary of whose birth fell in 1941. Professor A. Kaun (University of California) analyses the elements of nostalgia in Lermontov, while Mr Henry Lanz (Stanford University) discusses the poet's philosophical background (an attempt at reconciling Aeschylus and Plato) and his treatment of the myth of Prometheus. 'Lermontov [says the author], perhaps more than any other Russian poet or novelist, is entitled to a place in world literature.'

Miss Dorothea P. Radin gives a new translation of Lermontov's 'Song of Tsar Ivan Vasilyevich, of his young bodyguard, and of the bold merchant Kalashnikov'. Professor E. J. Simmons has an essay on 'The Writing of *War and Peace*'—based on his new life of Tolstoy now in preparation.

The title of Professor Clarence Manning's contribution—'The Neglect of Time in the Russian Novel'—is somewhat misleading. Its subject is rather 'the neglect of *chronology*' by Russian novelists, and the principal author singled out for discussion is Turgenev. Some of his conclusions are very interesting, but are open to discussion.

Other contributions dealing with Russian subjects are: 'A. N. Ostrovski: Slavophile or Westerner' by Professor G. Patrick, 'Pushkin and Oegin as Viewed by Two Generations' by J. A. Posin and 'A New Light on Saltykov's Philosophy' by Nikander Strelesky, author of a recent monograph on the famous Russian satirist.

This is a book of which American Slavonic scholars can be proud. We hope many more will follow in its wake.

W. J. ROSE
GLEB STRUVE

SHORT NOTICES

Two papers by Dr C. T. Onions on *The Fate of French -é in English* and *The Plural of Nouns ending in -th* (S.P.E. Tract, LXI. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1943. 26 pp. 3s. 6d.) inaugurate the seventh volume of this invaluable series, which is now in its twenty-fifth year. At first glance it might seem that rather dainty linguistic trifles are herein dispensed by their distinguished author. In fact, however, some notable features of our language are discussed and, within its own sphere, each essay is quintessential and exhaustive. The object of the first (and longer) study is to show how the varieties of representation of French -é (-y and -ee; -é and zero; -e and -ey) are distributed and how the distribution has come about. Of exceptional interest are the paragraphs on *committee*, *absentee*, *devotee* and *refugee*; on important examples of the modern period like *examinee* (1788), *illuminee* (1800), *employee* (1854), *escapee* (1865), *déportee* (1895), *internee* (1918), and *evacuee* (1940); and on the extensive group of heraldic adjectives of participial origin. It is shown that certain assumptions made by the *New English Dictionary* now call for reconsideration: the derivation of *canopy* from French *canapé*; the direct compounding of the verb *absent* with -ee to form *absentee*, which would be without precedent or analogy; the existence of ME *avow* (from *avowē* by apocope, French *avoué*, L. *advocatus*) which is based upon a misquotation; the appearance in *Sir Ferumbras of astreyey*, a misreading of manuscript *a streyep*; and the etymology of *demure* as 'a derived or extended form of *meure*, *mewre*, *mure*'. The second part of the Tract comprises a study, descriptive not prescriptive, of the alternation between voiceless [θs] and voiced [ðz] in the pronunciation of the substantives concerned, a study based upon the evidence of the orthoëpists from Hart and Bullokar onwards, the rhymes of poets, the statements of British and American authorities, the observations of erudite foreigners like Kruisinga and Jespersen, and the author's own recordings of recent and current usage. One very small point may here be noted. In considering the extraordinary development of one of the ME forms for 'moth', *moughte*, later *mought*, from OE *mohþe*, *mohþa* well-attested variants of *moþþe*, the OE *þohhte*, past tense of *þencan*, is adduced as a phonological parallel for the development of the diphthong. A better (and exact) parallel would be *bōhte*, past tense of *bycgan*. A few misprints have been found: 'reveilleé' for 'reveillée', p. 13, l. 4; 'atsreyey' for 'astreyey', p. 14, n. 1; 'this' for 'these', p. 16, l. 16; and 'bæ:ðz' for 'ba:ðz', p. 28, l. 24.

SIMEON POTTER

SOUTHAMPTON

Dr F. S. Boas's Shakespeare Lecture of the British Academy for 1943 (*Aspects of Classical Legend and History in Shakespeare*. From the *Proceedings of the British Academy*, Vol. XXIX. London: H. Milford. 1943. 28 pp. 3s.) reflects its author's close intimacy with Shakespeare as with Elizabethan literature in general, in his survey of the extent of the poet's classical equipment. His conclusion is 'that the dramatist's classical lore was for the most part gained at second hand' (p. 26). It was not, however, 'second-rate' but was 'rich and varied' and had 'seeped into his subconscious self' (p. 27). To some it may seem that Dr Boas weights the dice against evidence of first-hand knowledge. He questions the authenticity of *Henry VI*, *Titus Andronicus*, and the sub-plot of *The Taming of the Shrew*, where such evidence may be found. It seems to be going far to adduce signs of first-hand knowledge as evidence against authenticity, or to prefer to accept Field as a Latin scholar, rather than Shakespeare, when considering the tag on the title-page of *Venus and Adonis* (p. 4). With respect to Shakespeare's audience (p. 27), need we

deny reading to 'citizens and 'prentices, the groundlings'? For my part I find the Elizabethan drama incomprehensible on such an assumption. There was a large literature, and a long tradition in England, of 'popular' humanism.

The whole question is of great interest, and Dr Boas renews that interest by his fresh and delightful treatment. From many happy hints of value, I would single out his insistence upon the haunting of Shakespeare's imagination by the supreme figure of Julius Caesar.

C. J. SISSON

LONDON

The scope of the monograph '*Courtesy*' in *Shakespeare*, by M. M. Bhattacharje (Calcutta: University of Calcutta. 1940. xx + 225 pp.), is considerably wider than its title would suggest, more than a quarter being devoted to a preliminary survey of ideals of courtesy as evolved during the Middle Ages and subsequently modified at the Renaissance. A considerable body of evidence is cited from text-books and general literature reflecting the transformation of the chivalric code of knightly conduct into the more secular, less romantic notions of manners and good breeding which developed under the social and educational systems of the Italian city-states and were rapidly disseminated throughout western Europe. Viewed thus in historical perspective, against a background of changing society, courtesy, as represented by Castiglione and his contemporaries, appears in a new light, as an ideal of medieval rather than of humanistic origin, owing little to classical precedent. From this point attention is focussed upon Shakespeare, first through a general survey of 'nurture' as typified in Shakespearian society and subsequently through detailed examination of individual plays. The dissertation, like Dr Bhattacharje's earlier work on Spenser, shows wide and careful reading tempered by discrimination and supported by a firm grasp of material. The two opening chapters deserve special commendation as supplying a compact but comprehensive survey of the subject under investigation. The chapters on Shakespeare suffer from a too liberal interpretation of 'courtesy' and, structurally, from a tendency towards disintegration; but Dr Bhattacharje offers tentatively several interesting suggestions with respect to sources and analogues. His dissertation affords evidence of genuine scholarship and critical power. Its value would have been enhanced by more explicit foot-note references and by the inclusion of an index.

B. E. C. DAVIS

LONDON

Mr Eri J. Shumaker's *Concise Bibliography of the Complete Works of Richard H. Horne* (Granville, Ohio. 1943. vi + 14 pp.) is a useful compilation which not only includes Horne's acknowledged work but also identifies his pseudonymous publications and has notes on unpublished MSS. Most of the material for the study of Horne and his work is now in the United States, and Mr Shumaker, having used it for a biography which is still unpublished, has been enabled to print at least this bibliography by a grant from the Denison University Research Foundation.

EDITH C. BATHO

LONDON

Among Rainer Maria Rilke's voluminous and fascinating correspondence, the *Letters to a Young Poet* have always made a particularly strong appeal to lovers of poetry. For they contain an *ars poetica* which is at the same time a philosophy of life and an incentive to live beautifully. More than that, the ten letters in question form a work of art in miniature, and show Rilke's mysterious mind transforming the raw materials of experience into poetical themes.

The present translation by K. W. Maurer (London: Euston Press. 1943. 38 pp. 2s. 6d.) has caught the tone and rendered the spirit of these letters very successfully, and the appearance and style of the booklet are also in the Rilkean tradition. I prophesy favourable winds for this only apparently fragile bark on the sea of English life and letters.

E. M. BUTLER

MANCHESTER

The short treatise by Rajko Hariton Ružić on *The Aspects of the Verb in Serbo-Croatian* (University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Vol. 25, No. 2. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 1943. 150 pp. \$1.50) is a welcome contribution to a subject which has assumed a highly controversial character since the appearance, ten years ago, of E. Koschmieder's important monograph on the verbal aspects in Polish, *Nauka o aspektach czasownika polskiego w zarysie*. In this book Koschmieder followed up and elaborated the distinction between *Aspekt* and *Aktionsart* enunciated by his fellow-countryman, Sigurd Agrell, in 1908. Ružić now follows Agrell and Koschmieder in maintaining this (still arguable) differentiation for which he employs the terms *Aspect* and *Verbal Type*. There are two Aspects in all the Slavonic languages, perfective and imperfective: there are Verbal Types of varying numbers. *Aspect* expresses the 'point of view' or 'feeling' of the speaker: it is a subjective, psychological category. *Verbal Type* is an objective, lexical category: it is expressed by prefixes and suffixes (infixes), or by different stems. The distinction between *kúpiti*, 'to buy', and *kupovati*, 'to be buying', is the difference between the 'completed' or perfective aspect and the 'progressing' or imperfective: it may be compared to the difference between *žena*, 'wife', and *žene*, 'wife's'. On the other hand, the distinction between *hádžati*, 'to keep on walking around', and *hóđiti*, 'to be walking', is the (more subtle) difference between the iterative verbal type and the durative: it may be compared to the difference between *žena*, 'wife', and *ženica*, 'little wife, dear wife'. The author's limited purpose is to examine verb forms in the living language of Yugoslavia and in the recent literature of that country from Vuk Karadžić to the present. He prints Serbian, like Croatian, in Latin script, treating these two related tongues as one. He makes no systematic attempt to place his work on the wider (perhaps indispensable) background of Slavonic or of the Indo-European languages in general. His method is avowedly synchronic, 'primarily descriptive'. In the first main section after the Introduction, he summarizes the results derived from a survey of 'about ten thousand verbs collected from the dictionaries' and he then analyses their morphology in its relation to aspects perfective and imperfective. In the second (and larger) part, he examines illustrative sentences culled from various writers of repute, translating them into English and adding useful notes on all the verbs employed. This method leads inevitably to diffuseness and repetition but it is not unattractive. Delightfully we learn, in the midst of scrutinizing the 'second future' in *-budem*, that our Californian author lived as a boy in the Vojvodina and that he went to school at Novi Sad, lovely Danubian town. He should certainly be more wary when treading outside his chosen field. For example, in criticizing (p. 99) André Mazon's 'valeur originelle' of *budu* from **bhu-*, he shows misunderstanding, and in listing (p. 135) Jan Gebauer's monumental *Historická mluvnice jazyka českého* with four diacritical blunders in as many words, he destroys the confidence of his Czech readers. All in all, however, this is the best English introduction to this particular subject that we know.

SIMEON POTTER

SOUTHAMPTON

NEW PUBLICATIONS

October–December 1943

With the collaboration of PAMELA GRADON

GENERAL

LEWIS, H., *The Sentence in Welsh* (Sir John Rhys Memorial Lecture, British Academy, 1942). London, H. Milford. 2s.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES

English.

(a) *General (including linguistic).*

MORISON, S., *English Prayer Books*. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 6s.

NICHOLSON, N., *Man and Literature*. London, S.C.M. Press. 10s. 6d.

RICHARDS, I. A., *Basic English and its Uses*. London, Routledge; Kegan Paul. 3s. 6d.

(b) *Old and Middle English.*

BONE, G., *Anglo-Saxon Poetry*. An Essay, with specimen translations in Verse. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 5s.

STENTON, F. M., *Anglo-Saxon England*. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 21s.

(c) *Modern English.*

BOLLES, E. C., *The Literature of Sea Travel since the Introduction of Steam, 1830–1930*. [Diss.] Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Favourite American Plays of the Nineteenth Century, ed. by B. H. Clark. Princeton and Oxford Univ. Presses. 25s.

GEGENHEIMER, A. F., *Thomas Godfrey: Protégé of William Smith*. [Diss.] Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

GOLDRING, D., *South Lodge, Reminiscences of Violet Hunt, Ford Madox Ford and the English Review Circle*. London, Constable. 15s.

GREGORY, LADY, *Journals, 1916–1930*, ed. by L. Robinson. London, Putnam. 10s. 6d.

HUDSON, D., *Thomas Barnes of The Times* with selections from his Critical Essays never before Reprinted, ed. by H. Child. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 10s. 6d.

LEA, F., *Carlyle: Prophet of today*. London, Routledge; Kegan Paul. 8s. 6d.

Letters of a Grandmother, 1732–1735. Being the Correspondence of Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, with her Granddaughter Diana, Duchess of Bedford, ed. G. S. Thomson. London, Cape. 10s. 6d.

MACLEAN, C. M., *Born under Saturn: A Biography of William Hazlitt*. London, Collins. 21s.

MARSHALL, T. F., *A History of the Philadelphia Theatre, 1878–1890*. [Diss.] Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Newman Treasury, A, ed. by C. F. Harrold. London, Longmans Green. 21s.

POPE, A., *The Dunciad*, ed. by J. Sutherland (Twickenham Edition, v). London, Methuen. 30s.

SAMPSON, G., *The Century of Divine Songs* (Warton Lecture on English Poetry, British Academy, 1943). *Proceedings of the British Academy*, Vol. XXIX. London, H. Milford. 2s.

SPENCER, T., *Shakespeare and the Nature of Man*. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 18s.

WHITE, H. O., *Edward Dowden, 1843–1913*. An Address. Dublin, Univ. Press.

WILSON, J. D., *The Fortunes of Falstaff*. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 6s.

PLOT AND CHARACTER: ON THE STAGIRITE'S BEHALF

In my pertinacious defence of the authority of Aristotle as he insists on the primacy of plot, or situation, I have been much encouraged of late as it is borne in upon me how many of the most important critics have, explicitly or implicitly, come over to his side, or else have never left it. In 1927 I had recognized that, so far as Shakespeare's practice is concerned, Raleigh and Bridges, Watts-Dunton and Quiller-Couch were before me; and, as I have since discovered, the same, so far as Aristotle's pronouncement is concerned, was true of Mr Santayana.¹ What, however, impresses me most of all is the reasoned opinion of Mr Scott-James,² in 1928, which I have just happened upon, but ought to have known before. This, too, is for the Stagirite, but as supported by Coleridge and Goethe.

'The plot is the first thing', said Aristotle. We must have unity arising from a 'predominant passion', said Coleridge. Goethe is as direct as the Greek. In one of his conversations with Eckermann he speaks of 'the great importance of motives, which no one will understand...'

'The true power of a poem consists in the situation... in the Motive.' There we have the inner truth of the Aristotelian dogma translated into plain modern language, and it should be inscribed on a monument more lasting than bronze. Coleridge meant it, and fumbled with it. Goethe meant it, and said it clearly. The true power of a poem, a novel, or a play consists not in the characters, the thought, the description, or the fancy, but in the situation, or motive, which includes all of these, and is prior to all of them, in the sense that the whole is prior to the part.

And after that, in 1935, but independently, comes the more detailed and equally illuminating interpretation of Aristotle by the late Lascelles Abercrombie, in *The Principles of Literary Criticism*:

Aristotle asserts this with the greatest possible emphasis. 'The plot', he says, 'is the first principle, and, as it were, the soul of a tragedy; character comes second.' The assertion is strikingly at variance with the assumption of many dramatic critics, who regard a dramatist first and foremost as a creator of character. But, says Aristotle, character by itself, however skilfully delineated, will never give tragedy: it is only character in action that can be tragic (or, more generally, dramatic). Characterization is, in fact, as much a part of the dramatist's expressive technique as the prosody or imagery of his language; and what he is expressing is the idea of life which inspires him. The assumption that his chief business is to draw character is merely a relic of the naïve and unexamined belief that drama imitates life.³ It imitates a conception of life; and characterization is but a phase of this imitation. This conception is what Aristotle calls the action; and the essence of the action is its unity. It is the plot that expresses the action; all the rest of the dramatist's technique—character, thought, and language—embodies the plot. It is by means of the plot that, theoretically considered, the whole mass of the drama is held in the unity of the dramatist's inspiration; and it is by means of the plot that, critically considered, the whole mass of the play falls into a unity of effect. (pp. 102-3)

¹ *Poetry and Religion* (1900), pp. 272-3, 280 (cf. my *Shakespeare and Other Masters* (1940), p. 369, note).

² *The Making of Literature* (1928), pp. 243-4.

³ In the same book, pp. 85-88; his *Progress in Literature* (1929), p. 23; and his review of my article, 'Literature and Life', English Association,

Year's Work in English Studies (1924), pp. 13-19. Aristotle's 'imitation', according to Abercrombie, is not mimicry, not the 'imitation of nature', but is 'exactly what we mean by technique'; and as for the *dramatis personae*, 'their disposition to act is their character'.

By motives (*Motive*) Goethe means, as plainly appears from the context, not the psychological—not incentives to action—but *motifs*, such as there are in music or painting. What Goethe has to say of literary art is, as everyone (at least since Arnold's day) has known, nearly always momentous; and that particular pronouncement acquires special importance because psychological motivation, in both criticism and practice, had lately got the upper hand.¹ The sage had himself been given to it, but later in the *Conversations*, with remarkable self-effacement, he compares himself at this point unfavourably with Schiller, who hadn't been; and elsewhere the poet and scholar Abercrombie similarly explains the superiority of Hardy's *Tess to Jude*: 'Tragedy is somewhat mitigated when curiously employed with psychology.' Mr Scott-James, moreover, insists upon *motifs* to the point of quoting Arnold Bennett: 'Every novel should have a main theme that can be stated in ten words.'

And in 1939, in his little book *Rehabilitations*, p. 43, Mr C. S. Lewis has quite truly, though inadequately, said:

Modern Shakespearean criticism dates from the abandonment of the attempt to treat Shakespeare's plays as if they were novels. The change perhaps began with Raleigh's unemphasized observation that for Shakespeare plot comes first and character has to be fitted into it.

Inadequately, for the error abandoned was also that of viewing the plays as human documents, philosophical as well as psychological; an error that began towards the end of the eighteenth century as Shakespeare was being lost to the stage, because thought too good for it, but was falling into the relentless though not irreverent hands of Scotch philosophers and sentimentalists—Richardson and MacKenzie—and then of the German. Even Mr Lewis's second sentence is not the whole truth. Though Raleigh's words were more widely read, Bridges and Watts-Dunton wrote, or at least published, at about the same time or earlier. 'A thousand signs in his work', says the latter, 'show that with him [Shakespeare] the conception of the plot and situation preceded the conception of character.' And Bridges, also a great poet and scholar, made a remark still more to our purpose, to which we shall recur:²

Having found a story the actions of which were suitable, Shakespeare adopted them very much as they were, but remade the character of the actor. In the original story the actor would be known and judged by his actions:³ this Shakespeare reverses by first introducing his hero as a man superior to his actions; his art being to create a kind of contrast between the two, which has, of course, no existence in the original tale; and his success depends on the power and skill with which this character is chosen and enforced upon the audience; for it is when their minds are preoccupied with his personality that the actions follow as unquestionable realities, and in *Macbeth* even pre-ordained and prophesied.

In *Macbeth* there is the superiority—such a contrast—and in *Hamlet*, *Othello*, and *King Lear* as well.

Alike, however, these critics recognize the importance of the actual fact that the dramatist chose his story, or his central situation, first, and adapted the

¹ Eckermann, *Gespräche*, ed. Castle (1916), i, 107-8: 'Dass aber die wahre Kraft und Wirkung eines Gedichts in der Situation, in den Motiven besteht, daran denkt Niemand.' On p. 400 Goethe attributes to Schiller's comparative neglect of psychological motivation his greater success than Goethe's own on the stage. For Abercrombie see *Thomas Hardy* (1912), p. 159 and my *From Shakespeare to Joyce* (1944), pp. 198-9.

² Raleigh's *Shakespeare* (N.Y. 1907), p. 133; Bridges's *Influence of the Audience on Shakespeare's Drama*, Stratford Town Edition (1904-7); Watts-Dunton, *Harper's Magazine* (1906, v, 113), p. 815.

³ Not always, of course, in Shakespeare or other dramatists, particularly in legends such as those of *King Lear* and *Oedipus*; that he isn't so judged is often the attraction.

characters afterwards. As other successful dramatists did in his day, and those of Athens and Rome, of France and Spain, not to mention some of the most successful even in our time, he did not (though he shaped it) invent it. He took it—or was taken with it—as he came upon it in his reading or in hearing and seeing it when already on the stage. Hamlet's revenge he only treated anew, as Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides treated anew the already familiar tragic deeds or plights of Oedipus and Agamemnon or their wives and children. Likewise, as Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch says, it was certainly the meeting of Macbeth and Banquo with the Weird Sisters in Holinshed's *Chronicle* that captured Shakespeare's imagination. These greatest of dramatists thus alike chose familiar stories, but not merely or mainly because the audience would thereby follow the action more easily. They chose them for the big, striking, dramatically fruitful situation, which goes, as Corneille says it should do, 'beyond the probable'; and only a familiar improbability, as in the story of Oedipus or King Lear, is easily acceptable to the audience. In coming to a play with such a title they have already accepted it.

Now Corneille and Racine are supposed to be psychologists. But they both adapted historical or legendary stories, such as those of Cinna and Horatius, Phaedra and Iphigeneia; and Corneille, according to Brunetière,¹ often subordinated character to situation—even 'invented and constructed the situation first, and then, if I may so express it, put the characters inside'. Racine, on the other hand, has been thought to subordinate situation to character, 'finding the characters first, studying them, mastering them, and then seeking the situation which shall best bring out their different aspects'. This, Brunetière thinks, he did both elsewhere and in *Phèdre*. How he could have managed it there or in *Iphigénie*, when following Euripides (or Seneca) so closely, it is difficult to understand; and I have in a previous discussion endeavoured to show that he did not attempt it. If he had done so, the contrast Bridges values would have been lost: that is, of the good man doing the deed of horror, as according to Aristotle (cap. 13, 14)—ignorantly like Oedipus; wittingly but under external pressure or deception like Clytemnestra's son or Othello. 'In *Phèdre*', as I have said before, 'he has both the passions of a very good woman and also (in effect) of a very bad woman upon which to play. Like Shakespeare with Macbeth and above all Othello, Racine in *Phèdre* has the enormous dramatic advantage of dealing with a soul that is not naturally—tediously, harrowingly, or ignominiously—degenerating, but stricken and possessed.'²

Goethe, as quoted above and in the context as a whole, does not confine the import of his statement to tragedy or even to drama. In a recent article,³ before I came upon his words or those of Mr Scott-James, I have undertaken to show that Molière in the *École des femmes* is observing the Aristotelian—the ancient and Shakespearean—principle; and that the couplet

Il le faut avouer, l'Amour est un grand maître:
Ce qu'on ne fut jamais, il nous enseigne à l'être

is simply the pivot upon which the comedy turns; 'is not a motive of characterization but of play-making, is, indeed, a summary formula to evade or replace a motive. In substance it is equivalent to a proverb or adage, like *Amor vincit omnia*, and embodies about as much psychology'. It explains the action rather

¹ 'Loi du théâtre' (*Annales du Théâtre et de la Musique*, 1893).

² *Shakespeare and Other Masters*, p. 333 and Chapter ix, *Phèdre*.

³ *Romanic Review*, February 1944.

than the character: it produces striking comic situations, but does not reconcile the girl's cunning and ingenuity with her extreme simplicity and ingenuousness. Indeed, if it reconciled them, the comic effect would not be so striking.

Paradise Lost Goethe would certainly include. The fable (not, of course, to be tampered with) involved the hugest of improbabilities—revolt in Heaven, revenge in Hell. These are impossible or foolish, except as simply and frankly accepted by the reader, because they are familiar. But Macaulay, by the aesthetes nowadays so little regarded, had, though without making a definite application of it, a clear conception of the principle in question: 'Truth, indeed, is essential to poetry; but it is the truth of madness. The reasonings are just; but the premises are false. After the first suppositions have been made, everything ought to be consistent; but those first suppositions require a degree of credulity which almost amounts to a partial and temporary derangement of the intellect.'¹ The only trouble is that Macaulay, taking his departure from Theseus's pronouncement upon the lunatic, the lover, and the poet, in *Midsummer Night's Dream*, insists over-much on the lunacy, which, as in the suppositions or initial premises of Molière, of Racinian or Shakespearean tragedy, or even of those in *Paradise Lost*, is not apparent. His words might apply, however, to the postulates of the *Oedipus*—killing your own father and marrying your own mother and for years not discovering it—though a well-known legend, moulded into one of the greatest of plays.

Even in the modern novel, and of course in the earlier, situation is of great importance and sometimes comes first. Not, of course, in novels that are biographies, still less in those which are streams of consciousness (or of unconsciousness either). But in *Le Rouge et le noir*, as I have also elsewhere shown, so far from being a defect in the fabric, the incident of the attempted murder of the beloved in church was what fascinated Stendhal, much as Shakespeare was fascinated by Holinshed's fateful trio 'in strange and wild apparel', bidding the victorious thane 'All hail, Macbeth, that hereafter shalt be king of Scotland', which he then conspires to be; and by Cinthio's Ensign leading the deeply enamoured Moor to murder; and by Kyd's Hamlet learning the secret of the fratricide from the Ghost and then taking to madness, which both betrays and hinders him in his revenge; and by the traditional Lear casting off his only loving daughter because (as he thinks) she does not love him, to die of a broken heart because she dies. There is a great improbability, no question; but this is an opportunity, welcomed, even sought out:

...there is no adequate motive for the tender and noble Madame de Rênal's sending the disparaging letter which (when he learns of it) provokes Sorel to rush off and shoot her, and none for his taking such vengeance or not suspecting that she was under undue influence or coercion.... The deed and the letter both are justified only by the situation that ensues—the ecstasies of penitence and devotion, self-renunciation and heroism, for which in more natural circumstances there would have been no occasion. Never had he known how much she loved him as now when, wounded, despite scandal, she visits him in prison; never had she had such a way of showing it.²

The improbability is the price necessarily paid for the 'grands sujets de la tragédie', but also of the novel, which, if they are to move 'fortement les passions'—may the shade of Corneille not grow weary, if my readers do!—'doivent toujours aller au delà du vraisemblable'.

Now Mr F. L. Lucas,³ for whose judgement I have great respect, holds the issue

¹ Essay on Milton, *Works* (1898), vii, 8.

² *Shakespeare and Other Masters*, pp. 403-4; *From Shakespeare to Joyce*, Chapter xi.

³ *Tragedy* (1935), pp. 118-19.

raised by Aristotle to be remote, 'somewhat academic'. 'The truth is surely', he says, 'that the relative importance of character and plot varies with different dramatists and different national temperaments. To the Greek mind or the French, with their sense of how much more a beautiful whole is than the sum of its parts, Aristotle's view may seem true, and the *Oedipus* or *Athalie* decisive examples of its truth.' But quite evidently Mr Lucas is not thinking of plot as we have been: he is considering it more externally, as mere form and structure; not, like Aristotle, as 'the life and soul, so to speak, of tragedy'. Nor is he thinking (more narrowly), as Mr Scott-James is, of mere situation, in which characters themselves,

alive and interesting, shall be caught, tried, perplexed or harassed, and so put to the test by circumstance that what is humanly essential in them is exposed to our view.

(p. 64)

Still less is he thinking of situation as bold and improbable, which in itself offers opportunities for the sharpest and most striking contrasts, those whereby the passions are given farthest range and widest scope, as Aristotle and Corneille would have them be and as in the pages of the greatest dramatists they are.

Instead of being academic or subsidiary, the issue seems practical and central, at least when dealing with the earlier and the greatest dramas, but even, as we have seen, with some novels. Because of failure to grasp or remember the principle a critic reads the book or sees the play out of focus. He studies and probes instead of receiving and responding. He looks for tragic faults where there are none, or exaggerates what there are. He makes Hamlet a mental or moral cripple, Othello jealous by nature and (at the end) sentimental, Lear an outrageous egoist, Oedipus guilty not only (like him) of irascibility but also of impious insolence or even as blighted and misled by the complex so improperly named for him. The heroes are either psychopathic cases or (for the German or American Gelehrte of late) a prey to the deadly sins or the 'humours'. Heroes depraved or diseased—a contradiction in terms! And to this have we come, with our morals and psychology, so far from that ideal happily recalled by the contemporary poet, Mr Auden, as he says:

Both Pagan and Christian artist presupposed that their audience had a scale of values similar to their own, that they would recognize the Hero of Tragedy as what they would like to be, and the Rascal of Comedy as what perhaps they were but would rather not be.

(*Commonsense*, March 1941, p. 89)

Because of such failure, in short, there has been the huge accumulation through more than a century since Shakespeare—regrettably—left the stage, of inapposite, undramatic criticism, through which we have nowadays to flounder. However decided, the issue is, I think, practical and immediate, if in criticism any really is.

Curiously enough, shortly after writing the above, I have found that, later, in narrative poems—Dante's and Tennyson's—Mr Lucas fully acknowledges the primacy of plot, as not in tragedy. In his *Decline and Fall of the Romantic Ideal* (1937), pp. 121–5, he shows the superiority of Dante's Ulysses over Tennyson's, and largely because of the mere want of psychological motive:

Tennyson's Ulysses is far less than Dante's a victim of blind irresistible impulse, like some migrant bird...he lacks the superhuman, daemonic, Michelangesque mystery of Dante's hero, just because he tries to make his enterprise more rational and intelligible, by telling us, somewhat ungallantly, that Penelope is now old and his Ithacan subjects do not appreciate him. Dante's Ulysses went in spite of the ties of father, wife, and son—so overmastering was his wild desire....—In fact, Tennyson's

poem is an excellent example of the way in which the more classical type of poetry can lose in intensity what it gains in intelligence and intelligibility....Indeed the poem...does not seem to me comparable to *Tithonus*, where Tennyson's melancholy, passionate beyond all reasoned consolations, utters its vain and agonized cry against mortality.

That is, the situation is uppermost. Now, as not before, Mr Lucas is thinking of it, like Aristotle, as 'the life and soul, so to speak, of tragedy'. In sheer virtue of the situation, at the expense of intelligibility, the intensity is achieved. In Dante there is (though with no hesitation) a conflict, which produces emotion, and a contrast, which measures it; and what tragedy can there be in doing what you want to do, with good reasons for doing it? Only such tragedy as there is in life, rather than in character.

Since finishing the article I have read the late illustrious W. P. Ker's *Form and Style in Poetry* (1928), where there are opinions expressed upon the ballad, the sonnet, the epic and its versification, which are, I think, in keeping with those on plot presented above (see p. 41, and the following):

The choice of metre by a poet is not exactly like the choice out of a batch of samples. He has the abstract tune in his head before the poem begins. He lives in a world which is like the House of Rumour in Chaucer, full of voices. His mind is open and responsive to different poetical melodies, without words they settle in his mind, and it moves in anapaests or trochees accordingly, and the words come later. (p. 101)

It is because the sonnet is a form of thought; the abstract sonnet has the power of captivating the mind like the abstract epic. (p. 173)

Speaking generally and roughly one may say that unless the poet knows his form to begin with, he is in danger of failure; one would not give much for the prospects of an unmade poem which did not know whether to be in the stanza of *The Faerie Queene* or in the lighter verse of *The Lay of the Last Minstrel*. (p. 201)

An apposite (though humble) example is that of the 'Battle Hymn of the Republic'. Mrs Howe remembers that she had for some time had both the musical tune and the verbal in her mind's ear before the actual wording came.

ELMER EDGAR STOLL

MINNEAPOLIS

ROBERT SOUTH AND WILLIAM SHERLOCK: SOME UNPUBLISHED LETTERS

On 17 June 1693 Gilbert Burnet wrote to a friend:

I thank you for your books B^r Williams's Life is very ill written but is full of curious things but D^r Souths book¹ is a terrible one I hope the Dean of Pauls will not answer it we shall have a bloody warre on it if he does; to the no small diversion of the profane and of the Socinians.²

It was a belated hope; this particular controversy was the continuation, not the outbreak, of a quarrel. South and Sherlock had joined battle three years earlier, in private. The *Animadversions upon Dr. Sherlock's Book* (1693) and *Tritheism Charged upon Dr. Sherlock's New Notion*³ (1695) smack of the earlier dispute: they are spiced with allusions to breaking of oaths and turning of coats, allusions which plainly refer to Sherlock's performance in 1689 and 1690, when many were troubled about the oath of allegiance to William and Mary—some by conscience and some by self-interest. Calamy writes in his *Abridgement*:

Dr. Sherlock's Case, who was Master of the *Temple*, was particular. Had he taken the Oaths at first as others did, no more notice had been taken of him than of the rest: But he refus'd, and 'tis said, encourag'd others to do so too, and discontinued Preaching from August 1, 1689, to February 2, 16⁸⁹/₉₀, when he began again; declaring from the Pulpit that he did it with the Permission of his Superiours, and the Advice of some Eminent Lawyers. Upon this a Pamphlet was publish'd, call'd the *New Nonconformist*; or Dr. Sherlock's Case in Preaching after a Deprivation; shewing, that he hereby justified the *Nonconformists*, whom he, as well as others, had so much blam'd for Preaching after their being Silenc'd by the *Act of Uniformity* in 62. At length *Ireland* being reduc'd, and King James fled, he also thought fit to take the Oath: And it was commonly said, that King William's Success at the *Boyne* was the convincing Argument that remov'd his Scruples....⁴

Lathbury concurs in this judgment:

Probably he imagined at first that King James might be able to return: but when he saw William firmly seated on the throne, after his success in Ireland, he began to consider by what means he could retrace his steps.⁵

In the early stages of Sherlock's vacillations, he and South were in communication. It was at this time that the original offence was given, and we have a record of it.

On p. 10 of MS. History d. 1,⁶ in the Bodleian Library, there is a transcript of a long 'acct' of w^t pass'd between D^r Sherlock & D^r South. by D^r So.' From this it appears that, beginning on 8 April 1689, South had no less than six discussions with Sherlock about the lawfulness of taking the oaths. At first Sherlock was undecided; then, at some unspecified date, he put into South's hands some 'papers w^{ch} he had wrote for taking y^e Oaths'. But by 29 July he had changed his attitude

¹ *Animadversions upon Dr. Sherlock's Book, entituled A Vindication of the Holy... Trinity.... By [Robert South] a Divine of the Church of England.* London, 1693.

² Rawl. MS. D. 169 (19), Bodleian Library.

³ *Tritheism Charged upon Dr. Sherlock's New Notion of the Trinity.... By [Robert South] a Divine of the Church of England.* London, 1695. (The Epistle Dedicatory is signed 'A. A.')

⁴ *An Abridgement of Mr. Baxter's History of*

his Life and Times. By Edmund Calamy. London, 1713. Vol. 1, p. 485.

⁵ *A History of the Non-jurors.* By Thomas Lathbury. London, 1845, p. 115.

⁶ Described in the *Summary Catalogue of Western MSS. in the Bodleian Library* [entry 29781]: 'Copies of papers chiefly relating to the Non-jurors, 1689-1741 (with a few earlier and later), apparently made by Thomas Bedford (d. 1773), son of Hilkiah Bedford... Bought in May, 1888, from H. Evans.'

and on that day pressed South to read 'a discourse writ by him ag^t y^e lawfulness of taking y^e Oaths'; this discourse South read unwillingly, having by that time made up his own mind to comply—which he did on the following day. This was their last discussion.

Within a day or two after this [South's account goes on] I went to Tunbridge f^m whence I wrote to him y^t kind L^{re} of y^e 4th of August, but never rec^d any ans^r to it, nor visit f^m him after my return, tho I was in town for 4 months together, till at length I rec^d y^t base L^{re} of y^e 17 Feb.

But here I must take notice y^t on y^e 9 of December before he sent a Book then newly publish'd by him, intituled a Practical discourse of Death, at my receiving it I told him Serv^t y^t I thank'd his Master for y^e Book, but y^t it was more than I expected, & y^r upon I sent my own Serv^t to him y^e next day, repeating my thanks to him for his Book, & desiring to know whether he had rec^d my L^{re} of Aug. 4. he ans^d y^t he had, & y^t he intended suddenly to visit me, but he never came near me.

So matters stood in December. On 17 February, Sherlock wrote his 'base letter'. By that date he was publicly declaring his refusal to take the oaths and wished to suppress all report of his previous discourse in favour of them. He blamed South for spreading the report (though he was not the only person who had seen the discourse) and tried in his letter¹ to hector him into 'rectifying' it by a declaration that he, Sherlock, was refusing the oaths 'upon Principles of Conscience'. Here is the letter:

Temple. Feb. 17. 880.

Rev^d Sr,

Some time since I was inform'd y^t a Country Minister in y^e West, whose name I have forgot, reported, y^t in a L^{re} he rec^d f^m you, of all men you most wondred at my refusing y^e Oaths, who have written a very satisfactory Discourse, w^{ch} you y^rself had seen, in justification of y^e new Oaths. I was much surpriz'd at it, & thought you sh^d have done fairly to have told y^e whole Story, since you were pleas'd to tell part of it, y^t tho I had ind^d written such a discourse, & y^e had seen it, yet I told you at y^e time, y^t I was not satisfied wth it, but was convinc'd y^t y^e main foundation of it was false: however I hop'd this was only a secret amongst some few, & I was in part oblig'd to take no notice of it. But last night a Bencher of y^e Middle Temple, who came to town but on Saturday, came to me in great haste to inquire of y^r Story, & told me y^t M^r Smith, I think a Minister in Devonshire, told him y^t I had written a Paper in justification of y^e Oaths, as he was assur'd by a Person who had seen it, y^t I had prov'd y^e lawfulness of taking y^e Oaths, but abstain'd upon some politick reasons, or to avoid scandal; I pres^{ly} saw y^t this was y^e same Story, & as far as I can recollect myself, Smith was y^e name of y^e first Reporter, & now I saw it was no secret, & y^refore it was time to let y^e know it.

Y^t Letter I rec^d f^m Tunbridge was much of y^e same strain, y^e thought these Papers ought to be consider'd again, & mightily admir'd Power, w^{thout} w^{ch} a rightful Authority was worth nothing, as being of no use, w^{ch} w^d make a very good Chapter in y^e Evangeliiū Armatum;² & y^e y^r insinuate as if y^e B^rs had too great an ascend^t over me, & colour it over wth a very course complem^t to y^e B^rs, & a very fulsome one to me, w^{ch} was y^e reason why I never ans^d y^t L^{re}, for I was unwilling to commit it to Paper, & y^refore expected an opportunity of talking it out wth you. But this I had little res^mt of, because it was s^d to myself, & if this character by w^{ch} I perceive I am repres^d in y^e Country, comes originally f^m you, You cannot blame me if I do res^t it. You know w^t it is to betray private conversation in so tender a point as this, especially to tell a Story so imperfectly as to make a false repres^ation of it, w^{ch} is y^e spightfullest way of slandering, w^t it is done wth design. I can't be contented, Sr, to be repres^d as a fool or a knave for not swearing, to vindicate y^e honesty & understanding of those who swear.

But I must add something farther concerning y^t L^{re} f^m Tunbridge, because by w^t I have observ'd I suspect my returning no ans^r to it is taken by you as an affront. When I lately sent you my discourse of Death I was much surpriz'd at y^e ans^r my man

¹ Loc. cit. p. 9.

² The *Evangelium Armatum* is described on the title-page as *A Specimen; or short Collection of*

several Doctrines...destructive to our Government...Preached and Vented by the known leaders of the pretended Reformation, &c.

brought me, y^t y^e thank'd me for my Book, but it was more than y^e expected. I wondred at y^e meaning of it: for why sh^d not D^r S. have expected a greater thing f^m me than so small a pres^t? but w^t y^t man came next morning to know whether I had rec^d y^t L^r f^m Tunbridge, I pres^{tly} understood y^t meaning, & y^t was y^e quarrel, y^t I had not ans^d it; The reason of it I have already told you, but I made it my business to get an opportunity to speak wth y^e, & sent my man to y^t house in y^e summer to enquire whether y^e were in town, made freq^t enquiries afterw^{ds}, & as soon as I knew y^e were in Town, I went to Westm^r on purpose to wait on y^e wth I fell into some other Company, w^{ch} prev^{ed} me at y^t time, & have several times since been disappointed, w^t I intended you a visit, & if y^e knew how few visits I made in a year, y^e w^d not think this a neglect.

All y^t I have to desire of y^e S^r, if y^e have occasion'd this discourse is to do me y^t Right to rectify y^e mistake, & to assure y^t friend y^t I refuse y^e Oaths upon Principles of Conscience, & do not think y^t paper a satisfactory ans^r nor have any reg^d to Politicks or Reputation in y^e Case: for I had rather at any time own a defect in my understanding, than [in] my morals. I am S^r y^t humble Serv^t

W^m Sherlock.

He misjudged his man. South replied,¹ in terms which show what he could achieve in the way of satirical onslaught when unhampered by the necessities of theological controversy or the decencies of the pulpit:

Rev^d S^r,

I have rec^d & perused your's of y^e 17 Instant, & shall not take 7 months to ans^r it, tho I think it much more justifiable to take so much time & more too to reply upon a rude insolent Paper, than to ans^r one wrote wth y^e utmost kindness & civility: but y^e same temper y^t makes some men caress, applaud, even adore those f^m wh^o they y^{themselves} complain of y^e greatest unkindness & ingratitude, may naturally enough induce y^m to trample upon y^e kindness & respects of others: it being observ'd, y^t such mean Spirits as can grossly flatter, & abjectly cringe to any thing y^t looks like a *Superior*, generally pay it home in contempt & scorn & haughtiness towards y^t *Equals* for I acc^t such to have no Inferiors.²

I find in y^t lre a very angry accusation brought ag^t me for having, as y^e say, wrote something in y^t prejudice to a friend of mine in y^e West, of w^{ch} information has been given y^e both by one of y^t Countrey, & by a Bench^r of y^e Middle Temple. This, S^r, is y^t charge, & y^e take y^e wisest y^e surest, & most expeditious course of proving it upon me y^t c^d be, w^{thout} more ado, by taking it for granted.

But methinks, S^r, it looks something oddly, y^t [y^e] sh^d both accuse & clear me at y^e same time, & for y^e very same thing, for certainly you c^d not give a fuller character of y^e obliging civility of y^t presumed L^r into y^e West, w^{ch} I stand accus'd for, than by declaring it, as y^e do, of y^e same strain wth y^t other w^{ch} I wrote to y^e f^m Tunbridge: in w^{ch} place by y^e way I find y^t y^e are more than ordinarily known, & wth I came to understand much better than y^e c^d f^m y^e West, & y^t f^m more than one, y^t w^t y^e had wrote ab^t y^e new Oaths, was even then no *Secret*, ind^d so far f^m it, y^t one, whom I c^d name, told me, y^t he had by him at y^t time copies of both y^t Tracts upon y^t subject. So y^t all y^t [ever] then pass'd in discourse ab^t y^t y^t c^d be call'd peculiarly mine, was their commendation.

The 1st thing [w^{ch} I perceive] offended y^e in my Tunbridge L^r was, y^t I thought those (y^t first) *Papers ought to be consider'd again*. Yes, S^r, I both thought & s^d so, but yet wth all imaginable concern, deference & affection for y^e And I think further, y^t these are not y^e only papers w^{ch} y^e w^d have done well to have consider'd again & again too, before y^e had publish'd some others.

You tell me next y^t I mightily adm^rd Power, w^{thout} w^{ch} authority was nothing worth as being of no use, adding w^{thal}, y^t this w^d make a very good chapter in y^e *Evangelii Armatum*. S^r, I do again affirm y^t Sovereign Power actually possess'd (especially wth cons^t & call of y^e people) ans^rs all or most of y^e ends of Gov^t & y^t bare Right or Title void of such power ans^rs no end or use of Gov^t at all, & I leave it to y^e to prove y^e contrary position if you can. And as for y^t remark ab^t y^e *Evang. Armat*. I w^d have y^e to know, S^r, y^t I abhor y^e Principles in y^t Book, & sh^d abhor myself more had I wrote for y^m, but most of all had I wrote for y^m & ag^t y^m too: for my part I am abund^{tly}

¹ Loc. cit. pp. 11-13.

² 'Ans. to Whitby, p. 146, 147' inserted in the margin.

³ The MS. reads: *Lre presumed*, with numbers to indicate that the words are to be transposed.

satisfied in paying K. W. y^t allegiance y^t y^e Laws require (in giving y^e sense of wth I pretend not a greater skill than Cheif Justice Coke,) tho' I can't I confess plead such high merit of him, as to have attended him, & made one of y^e company ab^t him y^e very first night of his coming to town, & much less to have sent him any assistance in his expedition hither, while he was yet [but] P. of O., these were things above my Sphere, as thinking it enough to [do] my Duty to him now y^t he is K. tho I had no hand in making him so.

As for y^e *coarse Complement* y^e say I pass'd upon y^e B^s, y^e will do well to shew in w^t part of my L^{re} I do so much as mention 'em, & if y^e cannot, I fear it will prove y^e coarser complem^t of y^e two, y^t y^e apply it to 'em: for, S^r, it is not enough for y^e to talk of mere *insinuations*, & to bring in y^t *as if* [in to?] a matter of so neer a concern to y^e person y^e accuse: for in making a positive charge bare consequences, especially of y^t own drawing, ought to have no more force, than y^e in y^t last paper allow 'em w^t drawn f^m y^e Laws usually pleaded for o^r pres^t Allegiance. But why I sh^d be thought to complem^t y^e B^s so coarsely I cannot tell, for I never was a *Nonconformist nor Pensioner to any such* nor ever yet *preach'd in any Conventicle*, & if I had sh^d think I deserv'd a much *coarser complem^t f^m B^s* than ever I c^d yet hear they pass'd upon some who did.

But pray, S^r, how do y^e prove y^t other expression in my L^{re} concerning y^tself to have been a Complem^t? for if I really intended as I worded it, certainly it was none. And as I am sure y^e c^d have no immediate inspection into my thoughts, so I c^d assure y^e also (were it worth my while) y^t nothing pass'd thro' my pen in all y^t L^{re} but w^t issued entirely f^m my heart. And if y^e out of y^t wonderful, & yet unheard of, humility will needs, as y^e w^d fain seem to do, disown it, yet, I hope, y^e humility does not of necessity infer or argue my Insincerity. But waving all defense or excuse of it, if it was such a fault in me to treat y^e wth more respect than y^e are conscious to y^tself y^e deserv'd, I can but acknowledge & beg pardon for it, & promise to be guilty of y^e like no more. And yet after all, S^r, as *fulsome a complem^t* as in great good,¹ nature y^e are pleas'd to call it, y^e is a certain person in y^e world of y^t name, who, I am confid^t, thinks it no Complem^t at all, but y^e truth is, B^p Stillingfleet knew y^e right way of treating much better than I pretend to do.

You are y^e first, I know of, y^t ever taxed me wth *Treachery*. But assure y^tself, S^r, y^t I will neither betray my friend nor my Principles: You tell me y^e *cannot be contented to be repressed as a fool or knave for not swearing, to vindicate y^e honesty, or understanding of those who swear*. Wth S^r I look upon as a very *coarse Complement* ind^d (& far surpassing my Talent y^t way) upon almost y^e whole body of y^e Clergy, whom all know to have sworn. Nevertheless I am so far of y^t mind, y^t I can by no means blame any man for his unwillingness to appear either a *fool or knave* especially in so important a concern as an Oath: so if my life lay on it, I c^d not see how I c^d avoid shewing myself *one or both* of 'em sh^d I go ab^t to vindicate either y^e *understanding* or *honesty* of those, who can *publickly pray for* (i.e. solemnly before God & man recognize) y^e same person as y^t K. & yet refuse to swear Allegiance to him *as such*. Wth I take to be as great a contradiction in practice as any y^t occurs in Speculation, but y^e S^r y^t can write things y^t look something suspiciously y^t way, may possibly have a faculty of reconciling y^m too.

But to go on: You tell me y^t y^e *suspect y^t I look upon y^t not ans^ring my L^{re} f^m Tunbridge as an Affront*. And S^r y^e may do more than suspect y^t I do so, if y^e please: for it was wrote wth all y^e kindness & respect y^t heart c^d conceive, or such a poor pen as mine express, & y^e have wthout y^e least provocation spit both y^t & my friendship back in my face, And can y^e after y^t have y^e confidence to tell me of y^t *surprise w^t y^t man told y^e y^t upon his delivering me y^t book I s^d it was more than I expected*, & y^t y^e *wondred at y^e meaning of those words? for why*, say y^e wth great shrewdness of reasoning, *sh^d not D^r S. have expected a much greater thing form² me than so mean a pres^t?* Why, good S^r, to ans^r y^t Question & abate y^t wonder, it was because D^r South had long expected a much lesser thing f^m y^e & yet c^d not obtain it, & y^e fore thought he had no cause to look for a whole Volume f^m one who w^d not vouchsafe him so much as a line in ans^r to as respectful & affectionate as a L^{re} as one man c^d well write to another, for such mine to y^e was. Yet nevertheless if y^e thought it came to affront y^e wth such a *fulsom complem^t* as y^e affirm it did, then S^r y^e have another cause to surcease y^t wonder at my saying y^t *I expected not such a pres^t f^m y^e* for surely I c^d have no reason to expect such a *Civility* f^m y^e in ans^r to an *Affront* any more than I did or c^d expect such an affront as y^e have pass'd upon me, in return of all my civility.

¹ Sic.² Sic.

But S^r I am [very] desirous y^t some others sh^d be made Iudges of y^t Lre, even y^e severest & most impartial, so far am I f^r being under any awe of having any part of it revealed, for y^e will do me a greater kindness by shewing my Lre than I can do y^e by shewing y^t's. And it were a good deed to do it for y^e to all y^t acquaintance I meet wth, but y^t I scorn to concern myself so much in any thing y^t concerns a person, in wh^o I've scarce found so much as com^on humanity.

You proceed & tell me next, how in *pursuit of a desire*, forsooth, to talk it out wth me, y^e sent again & again to my house, w^h y^e easily might & I doubt not did know I was not in town, & since that, viz now for 4 months together, have been endeavoring to wait upon me, but c^d never yet (w^t thro' company or want of company) find an opportunity. Alas! for y^e kind S^r y^t so much courtesy sh^d meet wth such daily, weekly, monthly disappointm^{ts}. But S^r I fear y^e mistake me, for I expect not to be waited upon, that is a fulsome Compl^{mt}, but if any friend at any time thinks fit to bestow a visit upon me, I receive it thankfully & return it respectfully. But S^r if y^e can beleive any man to have so little sense as to imagine, y^t y^e y^tself believe this to be a rational excuse for not coming near me in so long a time, y^e must pardon me if I think I may wthout arrogance own myself to have more. The truth is, if it be y^t way to pret^d to visit & send after y^t friend w^h y^e know him to be out of Town, and never come neer or take notice of him w^h y^e know he is in it, y^e ought in all reason to be allow'd a sort of civility in point of visits peculiar to y^tself.

And now to my no small comfort I've got towards y^e close of y^t Lre w^h y^e tell me, y^t all y^t y^e have to desire of me is y^t if I have occasion'd this discourse, I w^d do y^t right as to rectify y^e mistake, & assure my friend y^t y^e refuse y^e Oaths upon principles of conscience, & do not think y^t paper a satisfactory ans^r (to w^t I pray) nor have any reg^d to politicks or reputation in y^e case. Now S^r this is too hard a task in all conscience to put me upon. But is it come to this at last y^t all this dirt & virulence must determine in an if? And will y^e attack me wth a direct downright charge, a charge of no less a guilt than of Treachery in conversation only for w^t y^e y^tself call but a mistake? & that a mistake hanging in y^e air by a pitiful invisible If? Well S^r to be short wth y^e in recompence of y^e length w^h y^e y^tself have occasion'd (, for Defenses are always allow'd to be longer than accusations) I do neither pret^d to know y^t mind (, for it w^d be no small arrogance to pret^d to know more than y^e do) nor do I know who y^t Bench^r, or [who] y^t M^r Smith is, or w^t particulars have been reported to y^e & y^tfore shall not concern myself ab^t y^m, but leave those to rectify y^e mistake, if y^e was any, who made it. And if y^e desire yet a more exact Information ab^t this business, it may not be amiss to send & make enquiry in y^e West, whether possibly y^t horses may know y^e way, tho' y^t man sh^d not. For my own part I will neither write any Lre, nor send any message upon y^t fools errands. But w^h y^e shall have proved y^e foul charge, y^e have laid agst me by something more than Ifs & Ands I will then make my Defense, & ans^r y^e charge either by a confutation, or justification of y^e matter of it.

In y^e mean time y^e true cause of y^t bitter ungentile Lre & of all y^e incivility y^t went before it, was my presuming, forsooth, to take y^e Oaths after I had perus'd y^t last papers. But I hope y^e will be y^e more merciful to me as to y^t point, since besides y^e best argum^{ts} my own poor reason c^d afford me, I had also y^e powerful influence of y^t own two Discourses to induce me to take y^m, viz. y^t w^h y^e wrote for y^e taking y^m, & y^t w^h y^e wrote agst it.

You conclude y^t Lre y^t y^e had rather own a defect in y^t understanding than y^t morals. And I comend y^e for it, hoping y^t in time y^e will vouchsafe com^on civility also a place amongst 'em. Nevertheless S^r y^e know it is not impossible for a man to be guilty of w^t he is unwilling to own. And after all, it is not w^t a man owns, but w^t he has done y^t he ought to be charg'd with.

And here let me tell y^e wthout a compl^{mt} & much less a fulsome one, y^t nothing has prov'd a more fatal disservice to y^e poor Ch. of England, than w^h men of parts & learning have, as it were, danc'd y^e Hey wth it: Sometimes pretending to def^d it agst y^e Schismatics & Dissenters, & sometimes again meanly & sneakingly, to say no worse, pleading or For Dissenters. D^r Sherlock's rather pimping for a compliance wth those very persons, whom by so many irrefragable argum^{ts} they y^mselfs had proved ought to be not complied with: but this perhaps you will call a rectifying of mistakes, & ascribe it also to principles of conscience, for I will grant y^e y^t y^e can be little reg^d either to Politicks or reputation in y^e case. But Conscience is an

Relig. Assemblies. Intro. p. 22.
23. For y^e Church. His ans^r to
Whitby's Prot. Reconciler.
part. 3. c. For Dissenters
again. His Sermon before y^e
L^d Mayor. 4. Nov^r 88. p. 19. 20.

unaccountable word, & they are not y^e Dissenters only who can serve a turn by it. S^r I shall say no more to y^e at pres^t, but since y^e have charg'd me wth y^e very worst of things *Treachery*, I shall upon this very occasion give y^e [this] one proof of my sincerity above y^e own, y^e I shall not so much as own or subscribe myself y^e friend or serv^t wth, so far as y^e can hinder, y^e will by no means suffer me to be: & y^efore pray take this one word at parting, y^e it is y^e who have broke wth me, & not I with you. And so farewell

Robert South.

19 Feb. 89-90.

Such was the private quarrel of 1690. It blazed out in public three years later, and its manifestations were bitter. White Kennett gives this account of it:

In the State of Religion, the pestilent Sect of the *Socinians*, by the Countenance of the Act of Toleration, and the loose Sentiments of some of our own Divines, had gotten considerable Ground in *England* since the Revolution; and being favour'd by the Licentiousness of the Press, they publish'd many of their Pamphlets, enough to provoke any Christian Government. To check their Insolence, Dr. *Sherlock*, Dean of St. *Paul's*, undertook the Vindication of the Orthodox Doctrine concerning the *Trinity*; but because *Mysteries of Faith*, being above Reason, are not to be explain'd by Reason, else they would cease to be *Mysteries*, it far'd with the Doctor, that whilst he endeavour'd to prove *Three Distinct Persons*, he was charg'd with proving *Three Distinct Gods*; having asserted, That there were in the Godhead, *Three Minds, Three Beings, and Three Intelligences*. This new Explication giving the *Unitarians* occasion to triumph, Dr. *South*, one of the Prebends of *Westminster*, and a Divine of great Parts, undertook to confute Dr. *Sherlock's* new way of vindicating the *Trinity*. His Antagonist was not silent, but by way of Recrimination, attempted to prove that Dr. *South's* Doctrine savour'd of *Sabellianism*. The Quarrel grew hot, the Two Doctors were learned and witty in their several Answers and Replies, and some of their Seconds began to come in to each side. On the Feast of St. *Simon and Jude*, this Year, at *Oxford*, a Fellow of *University College*, in a Publick Sermon before the University, fell in with the Notions of Dr. *Sherlock*, and asserted, (a) *That there were Three infinite Distinct Minds and Substances in the Trinity*; and also, *That the Three Persons in the Trinity, are Three Distinct Minds or Spirits, and Three Individual Substances*. The Friends of Dr. *South* made a Complaint of these Words, and procured them to be censur'd by a solemn Decree in Convocation, Nov. 25. wherein they *Judge, Declare, and Determine the aforesaid Words lately deliver'd in the said Sermon, to be False, Impious, and Heretical, disagreeing and contrary to the Doctrine of the Catholick Church, and especially to the Doctrine of the Church of England, publickly received*. This Solemn Decree was so far from composing the Differences, that it serv'd rather to irritate the Parties, and to let the *Socinians* make their Advantage of it. It was now therefore high time for the King to interpose his Royal Authority, by giving these excellent Directions...¹

The first two of South's attacks on Sherlock, the *Animadversions* (1693) and *Tritheism Charged* (1695), are in these days rarely but always honourably mentioned. They delight by unanswerable wit and manifest intellectual power, and they declare South's satirical equipment to have been but little inferior to that of Swift. The assertion may be made without folly; it has in fact been adumbrated before now.² But South's field—theological controversy and the sermon—was his misfortune.

Saeva indignatio is apparent in the *Animadversions* and *Tritheism Charged*. It carried South farther than his biographers have realized: he is the author, not only of these two works, but also of a translation³ of Benedict Aretius's *Valentini Gentilis*

¹ *A Complete History of England*. London, 1719. Vol. III (by White Kennett), p. 707.

² In Noble's continuation of J. Granger's *Biographical History of England*. London, 1806. Vol. I, p. 99: 'Swift left his wit at the church porch, South conveyed it into the pulpit; it blazed everywhere.'

³ *A Short History of Valentini Gentilis the Tritheist... Wrote in Latin, by Benedictus Aretius... and now Translated into English for the use of Dr. Sherlock* [&c.]. London, 1696. (The preface is signed 'N. N.')

Historia, and of the *Decreti Oxoniensis Vindicatio*.¹ The one has been tentatively ascribed to him, the other has gone almost unnoticed. The *D.N.B.*, for instance, commits itself only thus far:

In 1693 South intervened anonymously in the Socinian controversy, with strong animus against Sherlock, his 'Animadversions' on Sherlock's 'Vindication' (1690) being 'humbly offered to his admirers, and to himself the chief of them'. He made galling references to Sherlock's career, 'tainted with a conventicle' at the outset; vehemently assailed his earlier writings as heterodox on the doctrine of atonement, and maintained his 'new notion' of the Trinity to be tritheistic; an opinion reiterated in his 'Tritheism Charged' (1695). The anonymity of these attacks was quite transparent. It is not so certain that South was the translator of 'A Short History of Valentinus Gentilis the Tritheist' (1696) from the Latin of Benedict Aretius; the dedication to the hierarchy is in his manner, and there is a reference to Gentilis in 'Tritheism Charged', p. 47.²

The *Vindicatio* is not mentioned (and indeed its authorship is more difficult to demonstrate than is the authorship of the translation). Attribution of it to South must come of comparison with the *Animadversions* and *Tritheism Charged*, and must rest firstly on recognition of the manner and method of its rallery of Sherlock (the pose of stupefaction at his witlessness, the calculated offers to help him out with his thinking, the darker tones of judicial condemnation) and secondly and more surely on recognition of the identity of argumentative matter and method. This is so striking that South himself saw that it might destroy his anonymity, and attempted to forestall recognition by a pretence of reminding Sherlock of what the Animadverter had already said! Proof rests, not so much on parallel passages, though they exist in plenty, as on this identity of mental idiom, so sustained that to deny South's authorship is to assume an *X* who thought his thoughts and spoke with his voice and yet was not he. There are supporting indications: for instance, the very ascription on the title-page (*a Theologo Transmarino*) reflects the concern shown³ in the *Animadversions* and *Tritheism Charged* for the effect on the reformed churches abroad of unchallenged heterodoxy in high places in the Church of England. But to insist on these indications⁴ would be, as South himself said in another connexion, 'as if when we have a *Man's Hand-Writing*, we should endeavour to take his *Meaning by the measure of his Foot*'.⁵

The translation of the history of Valentinus Gentilis is his, too. The dedication is indeed 'in his manner'. The translation itself declares its author in choice of renderings and turns of phrase: the gauntlet is Benedict Aretius's, but only South could so have flung it down. It would be safe to assert this on stylistic evidence alone, but there are other grounds. The whole management of the translation trumpets his authorship. South had the satirist's native gusto for a damaging analogy; his sermons were famous for their parallels, so much so that he made enemies of some who gratuitously tried on caps that fitted unhappily well. In the history of Gentilis, condemned and put to death for heretical opinions concerning the Trinity, he found an analogy so apt that he could afford to be generous about it and to write in his *Advertisement concerning the publication of the following History*:

I am not here concerned to make an exact Parallel between the Heresie of Valentinus Gentilis, and the Opinion of Dr. Sherlock, as to all the Particularities and Circumstantial

¹ *Decreti Oxoniensis Vindicatio in tribus... Epistolis, a Theologo Transmarino*. [Robert South.] [? Oxford], 1696.

² *D.N.B.* (1921-22), xviii, 684.

³ In *Animadversions*: vide infra, p. 223. In *Tritheism Charged*: A3r & v (Epistle Dedicatory).

⁴ One may be mentioned. It is a pleasant coincidence, if no more, that South as well as

Swift has his battle of the books (*Animadversions*, 2nd ed. p. 227). The idea is often repeated in the *Vindicatio*, perhaps at its best in the description of 'Sherlocius' going into battle 'armatus Principii petitione' (p. 43).

⁵ *Thirty Six Sermons and Discourses... By Robert South*. Dublin, 1720 (5th ed.). Vol. II, sig. G4r.

of each; it being enough to my purpose, that they agree, and are the same, as to the main of both; (*viz.*) The Assertion of *Three Eternal Spirits in the Blessed Trinity*: But my chief Design is to shew the Noble Concern of a *Protestant City* and Senate in Vindicating so High an Article as that of the *Trinity* against this Heretical Tritheistical Innovation upon it.

And accordingly I have given the Reader not the entire History only, but also the Epistle prefixed to it, and Dedicatory of it to the Lords of the Senate, that so it may appear to all, That it was not written and Published at the sole Will and Pleasure of a private Man, but by the Order and Authority of the Governors of the Place, thereby Owning and Avowing their Proceedings against this Heretick, to the whole World: And I cannot but, in Honour to them, wish that all Christian Governours and Governments would shew the same Magnanimous Zeal and Courage in the *Defence of their Faith*; though I confess, I wish not, that they should do the *same way*.¹

The translation of Aretius's history is scrupulously faithful. But the italics are South's. These and the marginal flytings draw attention at point after point to the likeness between the opinions of Gentilis and those of Sherlock—and the points are precisely those which South had made in 1693 and 1695 (and in 1696, if the *Vindictio* be admitted in evidence) in his case for the condemnation of Sherlock.

Valentinus Gentilis treated as an exemplum was magnificently relevant to the current state of the controversy. Sherlock's opinions had at last (25 November 1695) met with the public condemnation South had repeatedly called for, but Sherlock was not abashed. He retorted, in his *Modest Examination of the Authority and Reasons of the late Oxford Decree* (1696), that the condemnation had been brought about by the private malice and intrigue of South; that those who framed it had no authority; moreover, that the substance of it was false. South replied first with the *Decretio Oxoniensis Vindictio In Tribus ad Modestum ejusdem Examinatorem Modestioribus Epistolis* (1696), in which he concentrated his attack on Sherlock's third assertion, setting himself to vindicate the substance of the decree, by maintaining in the first epistle that Sherlock's opinions were in fact false, in the second that they were in fact impious, and in the third that they were in fact heretical. The translation of the history of Gentilis is his answer to the other two assertions made in Sherlock's *Modest Examination*. Gentilis was tried and condemned for his opinions, manifestly by a sufficient authority, manifestly of no private malice; equally manifest is the parallel between his opinions and Sherlock's; the conclusion is obvious.

To translate a history in order to prove a point is to go to great lengths, and it suggests that there was a substantial score to pay off. In the course of the Trinitarian controversy itself, South had plainly had the best of it; that was not the score. The quarrel of 1690 is surely the occasion of that 'strong animus' with which South intervened in the controversy of 1693 onwards. Certainly, in his contributions to it, he carries on the old quarrel. Some time after the break between the two men, Sherlock surpassed himself by taking the oaths after all (August 1690). Reflection on this, followed as it was by preferment (June 1691), convinced South that there was justification for a charge even graver than that of impudence and in 1695 he said so in print:

This man indeed, for his part, had his Preferments all the time kept void for him. . . so that his Stake in the Church was sufficiently secured, while his Refusal of the Oath gave him opportunity to enter into the Bosomes of those who refused it too. . . I would advise him to lay his *Hand* upon his *Heart* (if he can find *where* it is) and consider how many worthy and sincere Persons have by the fallacious Influence of his *Example* and *Pretextes*. . . been brought, through their Refusal of that Oath, to Misery and Want, and

¹ Pp. 1 and 2 (sigs. B, Bv).

a piece of bread, when they can get it. Which, let me tell him, is a very dreadful Consideration, and when he comes to look *Death* in the face (which he will find a much harder work than to *write* upon it) may chance to lie cold at his heart.¹

The rancour left by the old quarrel explains why South so much relished his work when once he had decided to expose Sherlock in public controversy, and should be a counterpoise to the many censures passed upon his thoroughness in doing it.² Nor has sufficient consideration been given to his own apologia for his unsparing vehemence:

I Reverence none, who gives whole *Communities* and *Churches* such Words... And if this be his Way and Temper *never to give Quarter*, I am sure he has no cause to expect any, whatsoever he may find.³

It must also be remarked that three years elapsed between the personal affront and South's public repartees, which suggests that his resentment of Sherlock's treatment of him was not the chief reason why he intervened in the Socinian controversy, though it does explain the zest with which he laid about him once he had joined in. It would be an injustice to South to suggest that personal malice alone provoked the attack on Sherlock, in face of this three years' silence, and in face of his own explanation of why he intervened:

But it is now a considerable Time that the Book, here Animadverted upon, has walked about the World, without any publick control; and though in private Discourse generally censur'd by all, yet, (as to the Point undertook by me) hitherto Answered by none; which may well be Matter of *Melancholy Consideration* to all Hearty Lovers of our Church, and Ancient Christianity. Whereas I dare say, had this Heterodox Piece been wrote and published in a Language understood by Foreigners, we should long since have had several Confutations of it sent us from abroad; and probably not without some severe Reflexions upon the *English Church* and Clergy, for their silence in a Cause, which so loudly called for their Defence. To take off therefore this Reproach from our Church (in some degree at least) I have (while others, far more able to *Defend it*, chuse rather to sit still and *enjoy it*) ventur'd to set my weak Hand to the Vindication of a Principal Article of her Faith, against the rude Attacks of this bold Undertaker.⁴

And again:

The *Church of England* is certainly very Merciful; *Merciful* (as a Great Judge once said of K. *Charles II*) even to a Fault. For who, by her silence upon what this Bold Man has Wrote, and the Encouragement he has since received, would not be shrewdly induced after some considerable number of Years (if his stuff should live so long) to believe, that his Notions were the *Current Doctrine* of our *Church*, or, at least, of our *Church-Men* at that time? None then opposing them, most over-looking them, and some countenancing and advancing the Author of them; and, perhaps, for *them* too. This is truly the Case; and I hope to do the *Church of England* so much Service at least, as to break the Universality both of the *Silence*, and the presumed *Acceptance*, by one plain resolute and full *Negative* put in against it.⁵

This is as the spirit of Hooker: 'That Posterity may know we have not loosely through silence, permitted things to pass away as in a Dream...', or as the spirit of Clarendon: 'That posterity may not be deceived...'. It is surely honourable.

It is apparent from so short a piece of writing as South's letter to Sherlock that he possessed the three essentials of satire: strength of intellect enough for its 'fundamental brainwork' by which the irrationality and untenableness of the

¹ *Tritheism Charged*, pp. 300 et seq.

² Tillotson's comment was that 'the Doctor wrote like a man, but bit like a dog'.—*Life of... Dr. John Tillotson*. By Thomas Birch. London, 1752, p. 348.

³ *Animadversions* (2nd ed.), 1693. Preface, sig. A3r.

⁴ *Ibid.* chap. xii, p. 374.

⁵ *Ibid.* Preface, sig. A3v.

victim's position are exposed, a sure standard of conduct by which to measure shortcomings, and that special trick of style which appears to reveal the ridiculous within the unembellished facts, as the statue is found within the stone. These powers are more fully deployed in South's controversial writings, writings which have not deserved their present oblivion. They reappear, subservient to another purpose and therefore disciplined (but not therefore less effective), in the sermons. It is almost a literary impertinence to mention South's sermons in a mere tailpiece, but over the sermons too the iniquity of oblivion is already scattering her poppy, and a tailpiece which insists that this is utterly 'without respect to merit of perpetuity' may perhaps do South more service than the body to which it is added.

W. M. T. DODDS

LONDON

HIPPOLYTE AND HIPPOLYTOS

In making the time-honoured comparison between Racine and his Greek originals, critics no longer feel obliged to pronounce one inferior to the other; it is some time since it was customary to praise the *Hippolytos* at the expense of *Phèdre*, and much longer since *Phèdre* used to be preferred to the *Hippolytos*. But the tendency is still to disparage the individual figure of Hippolyte as an unsuccessful creation of Racine's, in comparison with the striking Hippolytos of Euripides. The causes of his metamorphosis are indeed understood since M. Bray's great work on the *Formation de la doctrine classique*; but they are generally held, I fancy, to constitute an extenuation, not a justification.

Bray may claim to have said the last word on the subject of 'anachronism' in French tragedy by his analysis of the ambiguous requirement known as *bienséance*. He lays bare two distinct conceptions concealed under the one term,¹ and shows them to have been at once equally binding and essentially irreconcilable, a fact no seventeenth-century critic appears to have realized.²

The original meaning of *bienséance* applied to the theatre was 'the consistency of a character with himself', i.e. truth to data provided by tradition—his nationality, epoch, rank, temperament ('Des siècles, des pays...'). The other was 'consistency with modern standards of conduct habitual to the author's public' ('Si le sujet n'est conforme aux mœurs et aux sentiments des spectateurs, il ne réussira jamais'³). Bray has called the first *bienséance interne* and the second *bienséance externe*. English terms seem to be lacking: for the purposes of this study, we may perhaps be allowed to speak of 'historical' and 'contemporary' propriety.

It is clear from our definitions that, in a dramatization of a Greek legend for a Paris theatre in 1677, it was impossible to observe both proprieties absolutely at the same time—one, or both, in a greater or less degree, had to be sacrificed. Racine's contemporaries were wholeheartedly, if not frankly, sacrificing 'historical' to 'contemporary' propriety: Racine, less completely, less wholeheartedly, and perhaps less frankly.⁴ Had he imitated them, we dare not say that his tragedies would have lost all merit, for his treatment of the highly decorative manners of his time is discerning and dramatic, and is stylized into poetry. But Racine was also a serious Greek scholar, and, at least at the end of his career—in *Iphigénie* to some extent and certainly in *Phèdre*—he made his public swallow as much 'historical' propriety as he dared, and more than his competitors dared. Recent work⁵ has shown that *Phèdre* represents a vigorous reaction, away from the bowdlerized *Hippolytes* of its century, back towards Euripides.

The time has passed, therefore, when criticism like that contained in the brilliant essay of Taine⁶ can appear either an arresting paradox or an adequate appraisal.

Many of the strictures he passed on *Phèdre* can no longer be upheld. (What critic now would care to repeat that remark about *Phèdre* expiring *sur une phrase académique*?)

¹ Op. cit. pp. 215ff.

² Marmontel distinguished them as *convenance* and *bienséances* (*Encyclopédie*, supplément, art. 'Bienséances').

³ D'Aubignac, *Pratique du théâtre*, ed. Martino, p. 72.

⁴ I have made this point in 'The evolution of

Racine's *poétique*, *Mod. Lang. Rev.* xxxv (1940), 19ff.

⁵ Winifred Newton, *Le thème de Phèdre et d'Hippolyte dans la littérature française*, Paris, 1939.

⁶ In *Nouveaux essais de critique et d'histoire*.

But some of them have not so far been challenged, and some must continue to stand—Aricie, for instance, whom Taine did not find time to mention, is a fairly perfect example of what he claimed all Racine's characters were, contemporary figures quite unrelated to their ostensible place in history.

Against his namesake Hippolyte, Taine's verdict, so far as I know, has never been called into question ('Quand Hippolyte parle des forêts où il vit, entendez les grandes allées de Versailles... Et savez-vous ce qu'il [y] faisait... ? des madrigaux'¹). Many have driven home the contrast between Hippolyte and Hippolytos, the *farouche et beau chasseur d'Euripide*,² whose arrogant chastity and exclusive cult of Artemis draw down on him the bloody vengeance of Aphrodite. Hippolytos *vierge et martyr*² on the one side: Aricie's lover on the other, a banal swain like the rest, or worse—so runs the general verdict.

The intention of this paper is to appeal against such a wholesale condemnation, and to argue:

(1) that Racine's Hippolyte retains much more of Euripides's Hippolytos than is generally allowed;

(2) That the lust-chastity antithesis, central in the *Hippolytos* and admittedly weakened by Racine, is replaced by a new and subtler effect of contrast which Hippolyte's new role is specially designed to supply;

(3) that Hippolyte in much of his role is indeed of the seventeenth century—not only however, nor perhaps most remarkably, as a lover, but in virtue of his delicately characterized demeanour towards Phèdre in the 'declaration' scene;

(4) and still more in a quite different set of activities: his curious political role, which has never been properly examined.

I. HIPPOLYTE AND HIPPOLYTOS

The Hippolyte of Racine does not prove that Racine failed to appreciate the Hippolytos of Euripides; for it is abundantly clear that Hippolytos was quite unacceptable to a seventeenth-century public, and had to be modified: the point is that he was not modified, like the Hippolytes of Gilbert and Bidar, out of recognition. The conception of ceremonial purity on which Hippolytos's conduct is based could have suggested, to Racine's audience, only one of two things—neither suitable in a tragedy—holy orders or sexual abnormality. It is not a question of timidity ('Qu'auraient pensé les petits-maîtres?'³) on Racine's part: his sole choice was to apply the rule of 'contemporary' propriety or leave the subject alone.

Certain elements in Hippolytos, then, simply had to be omitted. New elements were substituted—less, perhaps, because his conduct towards Phèdre required new motivation (for the contemporary, i.e. Christian, notion of virtue would have sufficed, as it did in Garnier's and La Pinelière's *Hippolytes*), than because the balance of effects would have been upset, Phèdre's love left without counterpoise, and her beloved without substance and personality.

But the point to be stressed here is, how much of Hippolytos is left intact. Racine was evidently at pains to preserve all he could of the character, and the poetic beauty, of the Greek hero.

In the first place, he steeps his reconstituted Hippolyte in the atmosphere of Greek legendary lore—the 'local colour'—with which the whole play is impregnated.

¹ Op. cit. p. 127.

³ L. Racine, *Mémoires*; J. Racine, *Œuvres*,

² Both phrases from J. Lemaitre, *J. Racine*, pp. 252, 248.

1, 282.

A word of digression may perhaps be permitted on this local colour in *Phèdre*, in spite of all that has already been written of it. In previous plays, though he knew his subjects and steered a clever course between the two proprieties, Racine had not seemed anxious to remind his public of differences in epoch and civilization (nor even to document himself, or so Professor Rudler once suggested¹). In *Phèdre*, on the other hand, every sensitive reader notices the eagerness with which he begins to sketch in the mythological background from the opening scene, and the persistence with which he directs our attention to it throughout the tragedy.

It is largely a matter of names, personal and geographical; details which seem petty taken in isolation, but have a considerable cumulative effect. As often as possible they are chosen for richness of mythological association. Thérémène's well-planned itinerary brings in

ces bords
Où l'on voit l'Achéron se perdre chez les morts, (11-12)

and Icare (14), who died escaping from Minos's wrath because his father had abetted Pasiphaë's unnatural lust. The list of Thésée's glorious victories is followed by that of his less glorious feminine conquests—and the incongruous quasi-comic effect is offset, not only by the poetry,² but by the 'atmosphere' evolved. The dread Minos and *le sage Pitthée* are rendered more impressive by being removed from the land of the living; they were alive in Euripides and Seneca. The active intervention of the gods is underlined by mentions like 'l'art par Neptune inventé' (131), 'les superbes remparts que Minerve a bâtis' (360) (she was patroness, but not builder, of Athens in genuine tradition).

This mythological light plays on Hippolyte. Racine does not attempt to show the Orphic ascetic of Euripides, living in mystical companionship with the chaste Artemis: but he takes care to present him as still *farouche*—

C'est par là qu'Hippolyte est connu dans la Grèce. (1109)

He is presented by the 'double exposure' method more than once used by Racine for difficult compromises between the two proprieties. Thus, Racine insists that Achilles, or his son Pyrrhus, is *impiger*, *iracundus*, *inexorabilis*, *acer*—or at least used to be—and often tells us so:

Madame, je sais trop à quels excès de rage
La vengeance d'Hélène emporta mon courage...
Mais enfin je consens d'oublier le passé. (Andr. 1341-4)

His record is historically correct; but his behaviour on the stage satisfies (or almost satisfies) the *petits-maitres*:

Sa présence à ce bruit n'a point paru répondre. (*Phèdre*, 409)

So with Hippolyte. Aricie and her *confidente*, Phèdre and her nurse, Hippolyte himself and his preceptor, repeat each other to drive home the fact that, less than six months ago (the time is specified, l. 539), Hippolyte was almost indistinguishable from Hippolytos. Has he altogether ceased to be?

¹ Apropos of his use of Rotrou in *Andromaque*, which he thought dispensed Racine at several points from turning to Seneca, Sophocles or Euripides. 'On ne le voit pas très empressé à "puiser aux sources sacrées", à "s'enivrer de la pure antiquité"; pas très empressé non plus, d'un point de vue plus moderne à lire devant lui,

copieusement, curieusement, avant d'écrire... Il va au plus court, au plus facile, au plus moderne, en artiste, en poète, en homme de plaisir peut-être; il ne procède pas en humaniste' (*Mod. Lang. Rev.* xii (1917), 449; 'Une source d'*Andromaque*').

² Cf. H. Bremond, *Racine et Valéry*, pp. 140-1.

Taine himself makes the point that Racinian tragedy uses a 'convention' like that of opera (or, he might have added, of ballet)—in other words, that melodious utterance, measure and grace are attributes, not of the characters, but of the genre. Racine's convention includes elegance of speech and behaviour. His models for both are sublimated forms of the best usage of his day, to which it seemed to him natural and necessary to turn. This is why his Greek local colour never extends to manners, which remain purely French: for instance, marriage of a widow to her stepson, 'incestuous' in *Phèdre* as in French (and Roman) law, was legal in Athens; the temple ceremony Hippolyte offers Aricie is Christian marriage in fancy dress, like all other references I can recall to marriage in French seventeenth-century drama.

It is agreed to-day, I believe, that Racine's Pyrrhus is a fine presentment, in his chosen convention, of a passionate brute—rendered more essentially brutal by his polish; whereas a really primitive brute in a Racinian setting would have been an intolerable discord. We, who no longer share Racine's social background, must make an effort to discount it before passing judgement on his characters. Hippolyte, if we can but adjust our vision, does not sink entirely into the décor but in several particulars stands out in striking contrast against it—the very contrast doing much to enhance the Euripidean traits he still possesses.

Hippolyte has composed no *madrigaux* in his forests: he has been running away from love. Only in the second act does he admit to himself that it was in vain. He considers his love disloyal to his father. He has no intention of betraying it to Aricie when other matters force him to see her (II, 2); but she has guessed already, and drags it from him by a deliberate challenge—the word 'inimitié' (518). He replies with what, in spite of himself, is an almost insulting reference to her '*charme décevant*'; stops, and bites his tongue—'*je me suis engagé trop avant*'. Then comes, not a moving, nor as Taine would have it an ingenious, piece of lover's pleading, but the chagrined story of how unwillingly he has fallen, and almost a complaint against her for having 'ensnared' him:

Depuis près de six mois, honteux, désespéré,
Portant partout le trait dont je suis déchiré,
Contre vous, contre moi, vainement je m'éprouve... (539–41)

Surely those who can read Racine must see here a true picture of

un captif de ses fers étonné,
Contre un joug qui lui plaît vainement mutiné, (451–2)

Hippolyte is in truth speaking *une langue étrangère*. How was it Boileau did not notice that the scene is 'comic'¹ rather than 'tragic'?

Probably he was deceived, like most readers (apparently), by the convention of elegance and poetic charm, which, as in the case of Thérémène, succeeds in harmonizing all unexpected notes.

Re-read a scene in which one of Racine's really accomplished lovers—as young, as ardent and as pure as Hippolyte—tells his love in a situation markedly similar in several respects:

Madame, assurez-vous de mon obéissance;
Vous avez dans ces lieux une entière puissance...
Mais vous ne savez pas encor tous vos malheurs,
... Si vous aimer c'est faire un si grand crime,

¹ Like *Andromaque*, II, 5 (cf. the notes of Mesnard and Bernardin *ad loc.*).

Pharnace n'en est pas seul coupable aujourd'hui;
 Et je suis mille fois plus coupable que lui....
 Attestez, s'il le faut, les puissances célestes
 Contre un sang malheureux, né pour vous tourmenter,
 Père, enfants, animés à vous persécuter....
 Jamais tous vos malheurs ne sauraient approcher
 Des maux que j'ai soufferts en le voulant cacher.
 ... Vous ne dépendrez ni de lui [Pharnace] ni de moi.
 Mais quand je vous aurai pleinement satisfaite,
 En quels lieux avez-vous choisi votre retraite?
 Sera-ce loin, Madame, ou près de mes états?... (Mithr. 163 sq.)

Does not this assured, polished (and sincere and touching) rhetoric show up the engaging clumsiness of Hippolyte?

II. THE LOVE OF HIPPOLYTE AND THE LOVE OF PHÈDRE

Hippolyte is still far from being Hippolytos. Racine has not kept Euripides's black-and-white contrast between Hippolytos's fierce purity and Phaidra's guilt. Is it possible that such a contrast, shorn (inevitably) of its religious associations, was too absolute to please Racine?

Instead of using Hippolyte in this simple fashion, he has made him—and this I believe has not been remarked—a foil, a prelude to the theme of Phèdre in a less tragic key.

The play is full of parallelisms of language,¹ some of which seem to have no particular purpose. But act II, scene 3, the declaration of Hippolyte to Aricie, is from beginning to end a foreshadowing, a first rehearsal in a pastoral vein with subdued quasi-comic touches, of the declaration, that of Phèdre to Hippolyte, which immediately follows. Verbal parallels underline the parallelisms in the subject-matter and development of the two scenes.

Each of the reluctant lovers has requested an audience in order to speak—so they have persuaded themselves—of impersonal issues. Each scene opens with a reference to Thésée's presumed death, and the succession question it raises. As Phèdre explains later:

Tremblante pour un fils que je n'osais trahir,
 Je te venais prier de ne le point haïr...
 Hélas! je ne t'ai pu parler que de toi-même. (695-8)

Hippolyte's blunder had been equally without conscious intent:

Je vois que la raison cède à la violence.
 Puisque j'ai commencé de rompre le silence,
 Madame, il faut poursuivre.... (525-7)

Phèdre, naturally, has a more oblique approach and shows deeper shame:

Ah! cruel, tu m'as trop entendue...
 Hé bien! connais donc Phèdre et toute sa fureur. (670-2)

She does not condescend to plead her love; Hippolyte in *his* declaration only remembers to do so towards the end, in one sentence. Both spend their time recounting the vicissitudes of their struggles against it.

Both have reproached themselves:

...Ni que du fol amour qui trouble ma raison
 Ma lâche complaisance ait nourri le poison... (675-6)

¹ Almost all information—Aricie's history, Thésée's history, Phèdre's fasting, her past treatment of Hippolyte, his character, his love—is given a second time in act II; lines and expressions echo one another (136, 146); even conceits go in pairs (425-6, cf. 503-4).

(cf. Hippolyte in I, 1:

Dans mes lâches soupirs d'autant plus méprisable... (97)

have sought safety in flight:

Présente, je vous fuis... (542)

C'est peu de t'avoir fui... (684)

but have been overmastered—

Moi-même, pour tout fruit de mes soins superflus... (547)

De quoi m'ont profité mes inutiles soins? (687)

—by the unescapable obsession of the loved one's beauty:

Absente, je vous trouve;

Dans le fond des forêts votre image me suit...

Tout retrace à mes yeux les charmes que j'évite... (542-5)

(cf. Phèdre in I, 3:

Mes yeux le retrouvaient dans les traits de son père.) (290)

The difference is one of scale, or of key; and it is great, for Hippolyte's guilt fades into nothing before that of Phèdre. Nothing more serious than the accident of a family feud divided him and Aricie:

Le ciel de leurs soupirs approuvait l'innocence...

Et moi... (1238-41)

III. HIPPOLYTE'S TREATMENT OF PHÈDRE

But this scene (II, 5) brings us back to the well-bred seventeenth-century Hippolyte. Racine with his Parisian audience was sensitive, as apparently Seneca had no need to be, to the extreme difficulty of finding an attitude in which Hippolyte could listen to Phèdre, resist her, and retain his dignity. To show him uncomprehending, then later outraged and moralizing, would have been to make him ridiculous; a step in the opposite direction would have made him unworthy.

Phèdre begins by asking his pity for her son. Then she dwells on her past persecution of Hippolyte—too complaisantly for her purpose, but for her this story is the record of the fight her virtue has put up against her passion. Her real drift is clear to an attentive listener from the beginning of her second speech:

Vous m'avez vue attachée à vous nuire;

Dans le fond de mon cœur vous ne pouviez pas lire. (597-8)

If this is not enough, she goes on at once:

Si la haine peut seule attirer votre haine,

Jamais femme ne fut plus digne de pitié,

Et moins digne, Seigneur, de votre inimitié. (606-8)

—for there is only one antithesis to *haine* and *inimitié* in seventeenth-century language.

Hippolyte, I believe, has already understood, albeit dimly and reluctantly. But he does not take alarm, for he can still hope to discourage Phèdre by feigning incomprehension. He answers her ostensible meaning, simply excusing her conduct,

though without extenuating it—without removing the barrier she herself has set up:

... Les soupçons *importuns*
Sont d'un second hymen les fruits les plus communs.
Toute autre aurait pour moi pris les mêmes ombrages,
Et j'en aurais peut-être essuyé plus d'outrages. (611-14)

Phèdre repeats with significant emotion:

... Qu'un soin bien différent me trouble et me dévore! (617)

If Hippolyte had still been in the dark, he would have asked what this trouble was. Instead, he adopts with tell-tale promptitude an obviously false explanation:

Madame, il n'est pas temps de vous troubler encore.
Peut-être votre époux voit encore le jour.... (618-19)

He firmly believes Thésée to be dead, as we know; but this consolation is conventionally acceptable. In reality, he is interposing as if by accident between Phèdre and himself the thought of that eternal barrier which ought to prevent her from thinking of him ('La veuve de Thésée ose aimer Hippolyte?' (702)).

Phèdre is not rebuffed; her expressions become more ardent and concealment is practically thrown off:

... Que dis-je? Il n'est point mort, puisqu'il respire en vous.
Toujours devant mes yeux je crois voir mon époux.
Je le vois, je lui parle; et mon cœur... Je m'égare,
Seigneur, ma folle ardeur malgré moi se déclare. (627-30)

Hippolyte repeats the same tactic, using all his insistence to force her if possible to accept the face-saving misinterpretation he offers, and again dwelling on his father's name:

Je vois de votre amour l'effet prodigieux.
Tout mort qu'il est, Thésée est présent à vos yeux;
Toujours de son amour votre âme est embrasée. (631-3)

Then follows the great speech: 'Oui, Prince, je languis...', in which Hippolyte takes the place of Thésée in the Labyrinth and Phèdre, 'votre amante', the place of Ariane. No evasion is possible, and Thésée's name becomes an open rebuke:

Dieux! qu'est-ce que j'entends? Madame, oubliez-vous
Que Thésée est mon père, et qu'il est votre époux? (663-4)

Even after this, he seizes with relief, as a means of escape, as a return to decent concealment, her momentary disavowal:

Madame, pardonnez. J'avoue, en rougissant,
Que j'accusais à tort un discours innocent.... (667-8)

He speaks no more in this scene, and his diplomacy fails. But his repeated parrying—

Par combien de détours
L'insensible a longtemps éludé mes discours! (743-4)

reveals in him a quick-wittedness and a circumspection for which his demeanour earlier in the play has not prepared us. Perhaps he has acted to avoid scandal rather than out of charity for Phèdre—about whom he later expresses himself with a (Euripidean) harshness that alienates sympathy. But it remains that he has tried to save her from herself, and even to save her self-respect. In his failure, at least he has saved himself, in the classical situation of Joseph with Potiphar's wife, from the titters of the boxes and the stage-seats.

IV. HIPPOLYTE AND ATHENS

To see the modern Hippolyte most clearly, we must study him, not as a lover, but in a role that has never been fully examined, though noticed by Taine¹—Hippolyte the political schemer.

Racine has devised a dynastic situation, parts only of which are suggested by his classical sources. Euripides's play contains the suggestion that Hippolytos may usurp power one day over Phaidra's orphaned children; Seneca shows Theseus presumed dead. The earlier French Hippolytus plays (up to 1635) do not develop the political implications of these ideas. Racine does so, and adds a complication apparently suggested by a tragedy of Tristan l'Hermite;² this was the linking of Hippolyte's beloved with the dynastic tangle. Be it remembered that there is no information about the classical Aricia more explicit than the short phrase in Racine's preface: 'une jeune Athénienne de grande naissance.' Her relationship to the Pallantidae is Racine's own invention. Thereby she becomes (like her opposite number in Tristan) a member of a rebellious and defeated branch of the dynasty, loved by the ruler's son, and potentially dangerous to the ruling branch since by bearing children she could prolong the feud.

Thésée then is reported dead. Several scenes contain discussions of the problem immediately opened up: Who is his heir?

Trézène, a part of Thésée's dominions but not of Attica, has been bequeathed to Hippolyte (this also is an invention of Racine's). But it is the throne of Athens that occupies the prince's thoughts. Of the three claimants, Phèdre's elder son (the younger does not count) is the legitimate offspring of Thésée's only legal consort. Hippolyte himself is explicitly debarred by the law of the land as the child of a non-Athenian woman³ (as Euripides had pointed out)—but apparently will not let this disturb him:

... Une superbe loi *semble* me rejeter.
La Grèce me reproche une mère étrangère.
Mais si pour concurrent je n'avais que mon frère,
Madame, j'ai sur lui *de véritables droits*
Que je saurais sauver du *caprice* des lois. (488ff.)

What are these rights more sacred than the law? Force? Popular favour? A spotless reputation? A primogeniture denied by the constitution? He has no others. True, his usurpation, if once he is strong enough, is expected as only natural by Phèdre and Cénone (201 ff., 343 ff., 355, 796, following Euripides). Phèdre herself proposes to bribe him with the crown (800).

But his political theory is at the service of his love; and he discovers that the strongest claimant is Aricie (Racine's Athens seems to be subject to no Salic law), the sole lineal descendant of the House of Erechthée. Her father, the heir apparent, had been set aside when Pandion II chose (unlawfully?) as successor his adopted

¹ Loc. cit. The discussion in Dubech's *Jean Racine politique* is inadequate.

² *La mort de Chrispe* (1645), which, as Miss Newton has shown (op. cit. p. 57), influenced the Hippolytus plays of Gilbert, Bidar, Racine and Pradon. Crispus, son of the emperor Constantine, had lost his life owing to the love of his stepmother Fausta. Tristan sought originality by neglecting the resemblances of his plot to the Hippolytus story, and wrote a political tragedy in the Cornelian mode. His Chrispe has just defeated the

emperor's rebellious brother, who is in hiding, but sues for pardon through his daughter, a captive in Chrispe's hands. Chrispe, who loves her, supports her plea; Fauste opposes it, her secret reason being jealousy. She poisons her rival ('il faut perdre Aricie'); Chrispe's death is an unforeseen result.

³ So the law of inheritance stood in historical times. But probably here we should say 'non-Greek,' for neither Euripides nor Racine debar the Cretan Phaedra's sons.

son Egée, Thésée's father. Hippolyte admits by implication that Egée was a usurper; he will not allow that Thésée's right was thereby impaired:

Athènes, par mon père accrue et protégée,
Reconnut avec joie un roi si généreux; (498-9)

but

Athènes dans ses murs maintenant vous rappelle. (501)

Hippolyte withdraws his own claim and offers to Aricie (without consulting them) the support of his partisans. As for the strongest claimant of all three, he need not burden their consciences:

Les campagnes de Crète
Offrent au fils de Phèdre une riche retraite (505-6)

—as king in Minos's place, we gather. (The statement is false to mythology: Minos had two sons who succeeded him in turn; but a line of Ovid¹ gives it some kind of authority.)

So the matter is settled to Hippolyte's satisfaction. Or rather, would be settled if Athens had not a will of her own:

Mais Athènes, Seigneur, s'est déjà déclarée.
Ses chefs ont pris les voix de toutes ses tribus.
Votre frère l'emporte, et Phèdre a le dessus. (722-4)

(Phèdre, as Regent for her infant son.) Worried by their divided allegiance, the tribes of Athens (historically the voting units for election of officers) seem to have sent delegates to a States-General, and decided by a majority vote which claimant they would recognize.

Hippolyte has now only one resource—civil war; and he will adopt it:

Quelque prix qu'il en puisse coûter,
Mettons le sceptre aux mains dignes de le porter. (735-6)

The return of Thésée ends his schemes and his independence. He has never considered himself disloyal (his forbidden love, like that of Phèdre, only showed itself in acts after supposed confirmation of Thésée's death), and he returns to the role of a good son, prepared, like Xipharès in *Mithridate*, to grieve but not to rebel at his father's treatment of his beloved—but free, unlike Xipharès, to confess his secret if necessary.

Thésée's unjust sentence frees him again:

Je permets tout le reste à mon libre courroux. (1356)
Libres dans nos malheurs, puisque le ciel l'ordonne,
Le don de notre foi ne dépend de personne. (1389-90)

Aricie decides that she also is free:

Je sais que, sans blesser l'honneur le plus sévère,
Je me puis affranchir des mains de votre père...
Et la fuite est permise à qui fuit ses tyrans. (1381-4)

Their plan goes much further than elopement:

De puissants défenseurs prendront notre querelle;
Argos nous tend les bras, et Sparte nous appelle:
A nos amis communs portons nos justes cris... (1365-7)

¹ *Heroides*, iv, 163.

This is sudden and surprising. We do not even know (from the play, at least) who rules in Argos and Sparta. Aricie is a 'legitimist' pretender, in a situation not unlike that of the exiled Stuarts after the Civil War or the Revolution in England. If the foreign policies of these Peloponnesian states (of which we are told nothing) are hostile to Thésée, no doubt they will give her asylum. Why the illegitimate Hippolyte expects the same favour ('amis communs') is less clear; probably only as Aricie's husband and champion—surely not because he is *connu dans la Grèce* for his chastity.

But Hippolyte does not look merely for asylum. The victorious claimant must not be left in possession of the field:

Ne souffrons pas que Phèdre, assemblant nos débris,
Du trône paternel nous chasse l'un et l'autre,
Et promette à son fils ma dépouille et la vôtre. (1368-70)

During the Fronde,¹ the citizens of Paris fought the king's troops and forced the royal family to fly Paris on the pretext of freeing the Queen Regent, in all loyalty and affection, from the pernicious influence of an unpopular minister. Hippolyte, in equal loyalty, is intending to make war on Thésée and vanquish his forces by the strength of conscious virtue and the help of allies (just as the Princes had brought in Spain). Thésée will be forced to reverse his sentence, banish Phèdre and—quite unjustly—disinherit her children, accepting Hippolyte and Aricie, united, as his heirs and loving subjects.

It seems strange that this ambitious project, briefly but clearly stated in act v, sc. 1, is not added to Hippolyte's disobedient love as another 'faiblesse qui le rendrait un peu coupable envers son père'² and a little less unworthy of his violent death.

Strange, too, that Racine, who had once held that

la tragédie étant l'imitation d'une action complète, où plusieurs personnes concourent, cette action n'est point finie que l'on ne sache en quelle situation elle laisse ces mêmes personnes,³

never makes it quite clear what Thésée intends to do in the end about the succession. Is Aricie to be declared his heiress ('me tienne lieu de fille', 1654)? What of the sons of Phèdre?

The answer must be, partly, that it is difficult to find room in a moving dénouement for information of this sort;⁴ partly also that Racine was not interested, and did not mean us to be interested, in this subsidiary material for its own sake. Much of Hippolytos had been scrapped, and Hippolyte's part and his personality needed building up. Doubtless we should be grateful that some of the additions are drawn from the political, and not all from the *galant*, stock-in-trade of contemporary drama.

In the least complex of his tragedies, *Bérénice*, Racine had learnt that the passion of one character is not enough to support the requisite minimum of plot

¹ These passing comparisons with seventeenth-century history seemed to me interesting and perhaps useful. Racine may not have had them consciously in mind, and I do not seek to put them forward as 'reminiscences' or 'allusions'. I only wish to show that Hippolyte's views on politics are French.

² *Préface*. But this defence of the Aricie episode is only an excuse for the inevitable infringement of 'historical' propriety, of which Racine liked

to pose as an intransigent defender. He must have read the continuation of Vettori's note in which he refutes his own suggestion that Hippolytos is faultless (see Mesnard's edition, v, 481 n.¹).

³ *Britannicus*, première préface.

⁴ In 1676, while writing *Phèdre*, he republished *Andromaque* and *Britannicus* with abridged fifth acts, excising the very passage he had defended in the passage just quoted.

and fill the requisite minimum of lines: to Bérénice and Titus he had added Antiochus, to provide interludes with the ups and downs of his hopes, which never come to anything. In the same way here, variety of interest is introduced in an action which is rather rectilinear for Racine—the working out of a destiny without misunderstandings, dilemmas or *péripéties* (except for the return of Thésée *ex machinâ*)—and in this way a foretaste of *Athalie*.

At all events it may be claimed that Racine's lack of interest in the Athenian succession shows that in *Hippolyte* it was the relics of Hippolytos he valued, not the seventeenth-century accretions.

R. C. KNIGHT

BIRMINGHAM

POE, BAUDELAIRE AND MALLARMÉ: A PROBLEM OF LITERARY JUDGEMENT

I

In 1852, having translated a selection of the tales of Poe, Charles Baudelaire sent a copy of his work to Sainte-Beuve with the injunction: 'Il faut, c'est à dire je désire, qu'Edgar Poe, qui n'est pas grand'chose en Amérique, devienne un grand homme pour la France.'¹ In 1874 Mallarmé published a prose translation of *The Raven*, illustrated with five of Manet's drawings. Fourteen years later he dedicated a group of translations from the poems of Poe, including *Le Corbeau*, as 'un monument du goût français au génie qui à l'égal de nos maîtres les plus vénéérés, exerça chez nous une influence'. In an essay first published in 1920,² the claim that Poe was a 'grand homme' was revived by the most distinguished of Mallarmé's disciples, M. Paul Valéry, who affirmed that Anglo-Saxons alone refuse to accept Poe as a poet. And M. André Fontainas seems to have made a no less partial, if less dignified, protest. 'Why the devil', he asked of an American correspondent, 'won't your fellow-countrymen admit once and for all that Edgar Poe was one of the most wonderful, most *influential* and most profound poets who ever lived?'³

As an example of our unregenerate attitude one may cite a chapter in Mr Aldous Huxley's *Vulgarity in Literature*. There we find exposed most of the artifices and mannerisms which have made it difficult for many of us to retain beyond our school-days much enthusiasm for the author of *The Bells* and *Annabel Lee*. 'The substance of Poe is refined', says Mr Huxley; 'it is his form that is vulgar. He is, as it were, one of Nature's Gentlemen, unhappily cursed with incorrigible bad taste.' Yet a generation or two of refined French poets could accept the practical demonstrations and even the more uncouth contrivances of Poe's taste as part of a technique which they continued seriously to imitate and extol.

The contradiction in attitudes seems insoluble, unless we shift our ground, as M. Maclair did, from the poet to the ideologue. We might then tentatively agree on a conclusion of this kind. If the quality of Poe's achievement leaves us in doubt as to whether he was often a good poet or invariably (*pace* M. Valéry) a successful versifier, the original example set by his tales and the germinating power of many of his notions about the nature and the art of poetry are beyond question. It would be futile to deny the enormous fascination that his tales, his ideas and his 'legend' have exercised even outside France. And though we might still refuse to impute greatness to Poe, we may have to agree with Maclair when he says from the French standpoint: 'There is an order of feelings and premonitions which hadn't been expressed by us before he came: no more can be said of the greatest.'⁴

In the most judicious book yet written about Poe, Mr Edward Shanks considers it plausible to maintain 'that he was the true parent of that movement which swept over Europe in the latter half of the nineteenth century and which

¹ *Lettres de Baudelaire* (Paris, Mercure de France, 1907), p. 91.

² As an introduction to *Les Fleurs du Mal* (Payot); collected in *Variété II: Situation de Baudelaire*.

³ Quoted from *The Literary Review*, 22 July 1922, by C. P. Cambriaire (see below).

⁴ Camille Maclair, *L'Art en Silence* (Paris, 1901), p. 41.

is described sometimes as the "Decadent", and sometimes as the "Symbolist" movement'.¹ For a quarter of a century, off and on, critics, researchers and thesis writers have been attempting to trace the ramifications, and to appraise the results, of his extensive influence on modern French literature. Few impressions emerge more clearly from a comparison of most of these works than that of the lack of finality attaching to asseverations based on such exercises in academic investigation. Nor could any academic exercise show more clearly than two or three of them do, the folly of entrusting a subject of this scope and subtlety to novices. Or perhaps the folly lies in allowing the results to be published. Among senior investigators one of the first is M. Louis Seylaz, to whose *Edgar Poe et les premiers symbolistes français* (Lausanne, 1923) subsequent students have been indebted.² Wider and more exact researches have been made by M. Léon Lemonnier, who has condensed his knowledge of part of the field into a small book called *Edgar Poe et les poètes français*.³ M. André Ferran's thesis, *L'Esthétique de Baudelaire*,⁴ the most comprehensive piece of recent scholarship on the French poet, has a section on the facts and consequences of his relationship to Poe. But in varying degrees all these works deserve the corrective of an admirable revision by M. Régis Michaut with its amply justified 'conseils de prudence à l'usage des spécialistes de la comparaison littéraire'.⁵ His article has a hygienic effect after the gross assumptions and *parti pris* of the source-hunters.

For me the subject has been refreshed by reverting, over the heads of the researchers, to some of the original texts and by attempting an approach along lines other than those used by the *comparatistes*. This has resulted in certain divergences of emphasis which I think point to shortcomings different in nature from those exposed by M. Michaut. The question I attempt to raise is whether studies of this kind can ever be effectively consummated if they continue to evade the problems of literary judgement and perception which underlie the complex phenomenon of influence between writers whose work has any literary value.

II

To many readers in France Baudelaire has been known as the translator of Poe's tales rather than as the author of *Les Fleurs du Mal*. But it was not by his work of translation that he established the American's reputation as a maligned and tragic genius, a hero of letters, a poet of equable distinction. The foundation for these views was laid in three attractively written essays, through which probably more than by any other channel the influence of Poe's thought and work reached the Symbolists. The first was a serial article, immature and mainly biographical, published in a couple of numbers of the *Revue de Paris* in 1852. Much of this was incorporated in the later essays: an account of the life and work, prefixed to the

¹ Edward Shanks, *Edgar Allan Poe* (Macmillan), p. 7.

² For instance C. P. Cambriaire, *The Influence of E. A. Poe* (New York, Stechert, 1927). I cannot share the respect Mr Shanks seems to have for this industrious work; but it is by no means the worst America has produced on the subject. M. Seylaz's, though suggestive and informed, leaves much to be desired in precision and sense of evidence.

³ Editions de la Nouvelle Revue Critique, Paris, 1932. By the same author: *Les Traducteurs d'Edgar Poe* (Presses Universitaires) and *Edgar Poe et la Critique française* (out of print).

⁴ Hachette, 1933. Dr Enid Starkie's *Baudelaire* (Cape) and her recent edition of the *Fleurs du Mal* (Blackwell) will be known to English readers. They are happily free from the excesses of the 'influence' craze.

⁵ Régis Michaut, 'Baudelaire et Edgar Poe: Une mise au point', *Revue de Littérature comparée*, Oct.-Dec. 1938. Cf. another golden text: 'La méthode des passages parallèles est mauvaise quand elle reste purement littérale et qu'elle se base sur des indications tendancieuses et des conclusions qui dépassent les prémisses.'

Histoires Extraordinaires of 1856 and the *Notes nouvelles sur Edgar Poe*, introducing the series of 1857. One of Baudelaire's letters reveals the intention of composing a book on the personality, talent and doctrines of the American, comprising these two notices augmented by a third part, *Dernières notes sur Edgar Poe*, which was never written.

The finished pieces are of considerable length, but they contain no criticism. Except for a few reservations, the tone in which the works are referred to would imply that Baudelaire accepted them as all of exceptional originality and value. He insists on Poe's virtues as a stylist, especially on the purity of his style. The claim that it was 'adequate' may pass. But such a phrase as 'Poe est toujours correct', though used to point a contrast between the unruly imagination and the deliberate control of the writing, holds one up; and hesitation increases as the encomiums multiply. Obviously there is no concern to judge with detachment. The admirer is transported by a mood of impulsive yet sustained appreciation, often intuitive, often erroneous, always assimilative. He is in the situation of the artist who makes more of his model than we can see in it. The model is 'good', because it shows him what he is looking for and how to realize it. And Poe becomes for Baudelaire and, through his insistence for two or three generations of French poets, a 'grand homme'.

Equally partial on the expository side, these pieces, by their compassionate eloquence, contributed greatly to the popularity of their subject. Indeed, since the most fruitful of his services have been the translation of the tales and the presentation of the ideas, we may, I think, define Baudelaire's practical devotion to the work of Poe simply as a labour of *haute vulgarisation*.

Much of the first essay is occupied with the story-writer, or rather with the tales, which constitute 'une littérature nouvelle'. The marks of the method are 'conjecturisme' and 'probabilisme', terms which are not defined but illustrated by numerous summaries. Here as elsewhere the writer shows himself impressed with the technical side of Poe's art.

The introduction to the *Histoires Extraordinaires*, almost exclusively biographical, condenses much of what had appeared in the *Revue de Paris*. The usual emphasis on Poe's qualities is effected by contrasting him with his milieu. The exalted tone, the high tension that vitiates the treatment should be noted:

Si vous ajoutez à cette vision impeccable du vrai, véritable infirmité dans de certaines circonstances, une délicatesse exquise de sens qu'une note fausse torturerait, une finesse de goût que tout, excepté l'exacte proportion, révoltait, un amour insatiable du Beau, qui avait pris la puissance d'une passion morbide, vous ne vous étonnerez pas que pour un pareil homme la vie soit devenue un enfer, et qu'il ait mal fini; vous admirerez qu'il ait pu *durer* aussi longtemps.

This is mainly a projection of the writer's sensibility and aspiration. Not that the points made are totally inapplicable to the American. The question is one of degree and of unconscious motivation. The delicacy, the finesse implied proceed from a tendency to idealize, we might say to 'sublimate', the *alter ego*. The dignity of the personality is referred to with equal exaggeration. Even his drunkenness has its excuse as a stimulant to genius, a method of work, the refuge of a superior solitary from his compatriots' lack of comprehension, an example, in fact, of 'ivrognerie littéraire'. Admitting that he has little to say about the work of this 'singular genius', Baudelaire concludes with a few more pages of biased, if brilliant, characterization.

Of the three attempts to present the American, the last was by far the most

important for the purposes of Symbolism. It is a noble piece of writing, sustained by personal fervour for the general outlook and aesthetic of Poe. The first half is a defence of the social and political attitudes identified with the model and endorses, with acknowledgements to *The Colloquy of Monos and Una*, his aristocratic disdain for the modern heresies of progress, democracy and civilization. Around a few selected texts Baudelaire develops, with a subtlety and warmth all his own, an apology for decadent literature, balancing original sin or radical perversity against inevitable progress and humanitarianism.

In the second half, following the model more closely, he expounds Poe's anti-utilitarian theory of poetry as an autonomous exercise of the spirit. After a couple of paragraphs on his conception of the short story, with a hint at the role in his art of science, method and analysis, Baudelaire concentrates on the *Poetic Principle* and its denunciation of the literary 'heresies' of the long poem and of didacticism, passion, truth or morality, regarded as the poem's *raison d'être*. Poetry is 'an elevating excitement of the Soul—quite independent of that passion which is the intoxication of the Heart—or of that Truth which is the satisfaction of the Reason'. Poetry is an end in itself, or as Baudelaire puts it: 'La vérité n'a rien à faire avec les chansons'.

All this he adopts, recasting it in clear, orderly, elegant paragraphs, drawn from more than one of Poe's writings,¹ but fused into a superior form. The argument rises to a high note, adapted and condensed from his model's most idealistic flight, to which a turn is given not to be found in the original: 'C'est cette immortel instinct du beau qui nous fait considérer la terre et ses spectacles comme un aperçu, comme une correspondance du Ciel...' This use of the word 'correspondance' Baudelaire took from Swedenborg. Despite what most commentators have suggested, it is not used by Poe in this sense, although it fits naturally enough into the idealism of his argument. For Baudelaire, Poe was an *illuminé*.

The exponent comes finally to the *Philosophy of Composition*, the explanation of how *The Raven* was composed. The 'extraordinary elevation, exquisite delicacy and accent of immortality', which he finds characteristic of the American's conception of the nature and function of poetry, far from having made him inattentive to execution, had sharpened his genius as a practising artist. In Poe's insistence on the choice of means to produce chosen effects, in his vigilant resistance to abandoning any part of the poet's task to chance, we see the source of that conception which has reigned in France from Baudelaire to M. Paul Valéry, and by which, in opposition to the romantic conception of spontaneous creation or improvisation, 'inspiration' is exchanged for 'control', the conscious domination and voluntary disposal of the means of art. The uses Poe makes of 're-echoing rhyme', refrain, repetition and 'retours obstinés de phrases' are enumerated with the admission that the value of such suggestive devices depends on the manner of their application. (They will be variously applied by the Symbolists.) Then, after another flattering characterization of Poe's poetry, comes a defence of it against the supporters of 'la morale utile', who are, as often as not, 'les mauvais critiques'.

The partialities of this presentation are obvious, but as propaganda it was effective, establishing the popularity of Poe's aesthetic and example for half a century. For the American presents an acute case of the writer whose influence abroad is his reputation. The tales attracted many of the poets who succeeded Baudelaire, some imitating them in their own short stories, others appropriating

¹ E.g. a paragraph on the poet, *genus irritabile*, is a literal rendering of one of the *Fifty Suggestions*.

much from them in theme, technique or atmosphere for their poems and plays. Yet, from the poetic standpoint, these are side-issues compared with the importance of the ideas. The whole aesthetic system of the most influential of modern French poets, says Ferran, was founded on suggestions from *The Poetic Principle*. Verlaine's *Art Poétique* he derives from the same source.¹ And when allowances are made for the wholesale way in which some researchers tend to identify what is most characteristic of one author with the work of a predecessor, that a measure of truth adheres to these assertions is confirmed by the opinion and experience of M. Valéry, who, from the earliest essays in *Variété* I to the lectures he delivered at the Collège de France before the outbreak of the present war, has reiterated his sense of indebtedness in terms direct or indirect: 'Poe montrait une voie, il enseignait une doctrine très séduisante et très rigoureuse, dans laquelle une sorte de mathématique et une sorte de mystique s'unissaient'...²

III

What good fortune, it has been suggested, for Poe to have found his protagonist. But was the luck not also Baudelaire's to have discovered the perfect model, the man, the poet, the experimentalist, appropriately distanced and practically unknown, on whom he could project his ideal? The lack of judgement—it was also a lack of knowledge—results in an erroneous impression of constant elevation and equable distinction, qualities in which Poe's work is conspicuously deficient. No perception is shown of the characteristic alternations of soaring philosopher and hack writer. For the most serious defect of Baudelaire's presentation is not that it pitches the note too high, but that it gives no hint of realizing that Poe's fluctuations show, in Mr Shanks's words, 'the wildest oscillations between good and bad'.³

It is such contrasts in judgement that present the authentic problem in the study of this relationship, the problem they raise being literary and not factual, moral or psychological. To be germinative and effective, it would appear, an influence need not of necessity be based on exact, circumstantial comprehension of an original. It may proceed from a predominantly subjective apprehension, in which the original becomes more or less transformed or denaturalized in the crucible of the admirer's enthusiasm. Mallarmé is said to have 'corrected' the vision of Baudelaire. This, I think, is doubtful. Verlaine was certainly nearer than either in artistic temper to Poe. But for them as for a hundred other French writers, the conception of the American and his work has for almost a century differed radically from the general reaction and estimate common in England and America. If ever finality is to be reached in this matter, is it likely to come by ignoring this divergence?

Baudelaire, as d'Aurevilly put it, 'translated Poe twice, in his works and in his life, although the latter wasn't comparable'. Allowances must be made, since the biographical material on which he drew was limited and prejudiced. His abhorrence of Griswold, the 'vampire-pedagogue', may have made him partial to the generous impressions left by Poe's few friends. His exaggeration of unpropitious circumstances into a 'special anathema', against which the luckless writer was

¹ Actually Poe's comparisons of poetry with music as indefinite arts, which closely resemble Verlaine's argument, are to be found not, as Ferran implies, in *The Poetic Principle*, but elsewhere, e.g. *Marginalia*, ccxiv.

² *Situation de Baudelaire*. M. Valéry finds that

Baudelaire's work conforms 'remarkably' to the precepts of Poe. But what conformities he notes in *Les Fleurs du Mal* are negative points—lack of anecdote or description etc.—which distinguish them from the poems of the Romantics.

³ Op. cit. p. 8.

thought incessantly to have struggled, turns the relapsing inebriate, whom some people were eager to help, into a hero with the world against him. The belief in his 'vast learning', his 'knowledge of several tongues', his 'haute distinction naturelle' are equally wide of the mark. But these misconceptions are explicable on a basis of ascertainable fact, access to which was impossible to Baudelaire. What so far has not been explained—and it cannot be explained on such a basis—is how a critic of Baudelaire's penetration could have acclaimed Poe as a perfect artist and a man of refined taste. For this kind of estimate he had not to rely on hearsay or comment; the works were in his hands and he had translated many of them.

Of this problem none of the researchers show themselves aware. Ferran insists that Baudelaire, after daily contact with the work of Poe, had come to re-live it in his own experience to the point of identifying its author with himself even more perhaps than he identified himself with its author. From the first he applied tastes, attitudes and aspirations to the object of his admiration which were far more characteristically his own. Although induced by arguments found in the American's writings to exchange his early democratic leanings for an attitude of aristocratic aloofness, the Frenchman endowed the American with a 'dandyism', an affectation of Satanic revolt, which was part of his own mode of life and thought, but which had never belonged to the man he admired. The sinister Poe who might have escaped from a novel by Sue, the romantic fallen angel, the saturnine poet, the macabre inebriate—these, he says, constitute the figure of a legend.¹

But Ferran is almost exclusively concerned with the moral and ideological aspects of what he calls this case of 'co-penetration'. That Baudelaire transforms Poe into a literary model by enhancing his qualities and endowing him, here too, with qualities of his own; that his presentation rests on a misconception of, or an indifference to, the intrinsic value of Poe's work, which is unconsciously assimilated to the Frenchman's standards and achievements—this aspect of the phenomenon has not received sufficient attention, if any at all. Ferran contrasts Baudelaire's conception of Poe, the man, with the reality; Baudelaire's estimate of the poet and writer he makes no attempt to compare with the poet and writer Poe actually was.

The root of the French poet's misrepresentation was not in having conceived of the American as 'un jeune gentleman de génie, vaquant quelquefois à la littérature au milieu de mille occupations d'une vie élégante'; he had already seen his mistake, when he used these words.² His important error was to acclaim Poe as an 'aristocratic' artist, the type who dominates his work, who invariably strives to produce work perfectly finished according to self-imposed standards. Baudelaire strove to live up to this ideal. The reverse is true of Poe. He preached the doctrine of control in tones that were to find echoes in France for a century; but he cannot be said to have practised it with any consistency, except perhaps for the length of a tale. 'He was not by temper a meticulous artist', says Mr Middleton Murry in the most favourable account of his poetry I have read.³ On Poe's abundant lapses of taste, his very frequent depressions, Baudelaire is silent; though the American was not unaware of them. 'In defence of my own taste', he wrote in the preface to the 1849 edition of the poems, 'it is incumbent upon me to say that I think nothing in this volume of much value to the public or very creditable

¹ Op. cit. p. 202.

² In *Le Pays*, 25 July 1854. See *Histoires Extraordinaires*, Conard, p. 391.

³ *Discoveries: Poe's Poetry*.

to myself.' But what Poe may have felt is not to the point. It is with the impression his French admirers give of him as an artist that we are here concerned, and with the contrast between that and the impression his work as a whole makes on us. The problem of influence has become a problem of literary judgement.

IV

To his American public Poe was fond of presenting himself as an arbiter of taste, a role he attempted to fill seriously. That he was perpetually concerned with problems of taste is evident from his critical and theoretical writings; and it is possible that he achieved more than has been recorded by dinning them into the ears of his countrymen. But when it comes to his own taste as reflected in his work, whether or not we should wish to decorate rooms according to a scheme based on the *Philosophy of Furniture* or regard *Landor's Cottage* as a model of appropriate design, what nowadays seems to admit of little doubt is that English readers do not—with some notable exceptions—think highly of Poe's verse; approval, at best, is shown for very little of it.

Finely appreciative points have been made about some of the poems by Mr Walter de la Mare. 'Concerning no man of genius or of fudge', he says, 'are the critics even of our own days more acridly at odds.'¹ But the unflattering alternative, which is repeated in another context, seems to indicate a sense of damaging inequalities. Apart from the selected favourite, *To Helen*, which Mr Shanks describes as 'the best poem so uncharacteristic of its author that ever was written',² which Lowell thought fit for the Greek Anthology and which for Baudelaire seems to have been no more than an immature pastiche, the better pieces are rarely exhibited. Mr Murry and Mr Shanks have praised certain fragments and short poems like *Romance*, *The Sleeper*, *Israfel*, and Mr de la Mare points to that remarkable juvenile song—

The bower whereat in dreams I see....

In these the characteristic mannerisms are subtly disposed, not hammered home as in those that have made Poe's reputation: *The Raven*, *The Bells*, *Annabel Lee*, *For Annie*. They are pronounced even in *Ulalume*, to the influence of which Mr Shanks attaches singular importance.

Emerson called Poe the 'jingle-man'; and there is a kind of pathos in the fact that, having written so much about his art—on tone, appropriateness, effect, rhyme, rhythm, alliteration, refrains and repetitive devices—he should have produced to illustrate his theories some of the vulgarest tintinnabulations in English verse, as 'grim, ungainly, ghastly, gaunt' as the reappearances of his ominous bird, providing patterns of clamorous doggerel for schoolboys to parody or light-versifiers to emulate for their heavier blows. Is there not something of a literary curiosity in the fact that certain French poets—reputed to rank with the most exquisite of their race—should have troubled to adapt so many of Poe's tricks and tags to their purposes, producing, even when crudities are softened, effects which appear to be no more in keeping with the French tradition than their prototypes were with the English? 'Poe's care for technique', says Mr Shanks, 'became an inflammation.'³ The excitement over it in France raged around the more 'inflamed' pieces of artifice. Those that receive honourable mention from Baudelaire are

¹ *Early One Morning*, pp. 246-7.

² Op. cit. p. 88.

³ Op. cit. p. 175. The French admirers are not

alone in their attitude to Poe's technique. Mr Shanks reminds us of the equally ecstatic admiration of John Davidson.

The Bells—‘une véritable curiosité littéraire’—*The Raven*, *Dreamland*, *Ulalume*, *Annabel Lee*; and what the successors of Baudelaire imitate are precisely the more mechanical mannerisms. From him to the last of the Symbolists and from the first to the latest French investigator of the influence, the reiterated praise or the implied approval of Poe’s style and technique—especially the recommendation of his ‘complicated rhythms’—seems completely to miss both the ‘something meretricious’, detected in the poems by an admirer like Mr Arthur Symonds and the defects that D. H. Lawrence exposed in *Studies in Classical American Literature*:

All Poe’s style has this mechanical quality as his poetry has a mechanical rhythm. He never sees anything in terms of life, almost always in terms of matter, jewels, marbles, etc.—or in terms of force, scientific. And his cadences are all managed mechanically. That is what is called ‘having style’.

The difficulty of appreciating the effects of technical innovation in a foreign medium is formidable. It is obvious that Poe’s French admirers could not have felt the defects and excesses of his manner as we do.¹ The American was a restless experimenter, providing patterns which, transplanted in the poetic soil of late nineteenth-century France, produced, along with a crop of flat, unassimilated pastiches, a few repetitive varieties which, manipulated by the delicate touch of a Verlaine, are not without charm. On the whole, however, the effects of this craze were disastrous.

This view is, of course, subject to the reservations we have just made. Nothing could better illustrate the difficulty of dealing with an influence between writers in different languages than the realization that, to be effective, the judgement must operate at ease and with equal assurance in the foreign as well as in the native literature. The best results might perhaps be obtained by the co-operation of two critical minds representing the nationalities of the writers under consideration. All that can be said in support of our own view is that the cruder imitations, such as many of those practised by Henri de Régnier, strike us as totally out of keeping with the tradition of French poetical expression, and, more objectively, that such experiments have had no sequel. They remain, if ever they are recalled, the eccentric monopoly of the more degenerate of the Decadents, who were, in fact, the direct progeny of the *engouement* for Poe.

But as a model Poe’s poetry has more intimate disqualifications than the crudities of its technique. Of his slender output, much hovers between sentimentality and melodrama. Much is immature in conception and facile in execution. For Mr Shanks its effect is ‘blurred’. How then could Baudelaire and, forty years later, Mallarmé reach and reiterate their conviction of its ‘crystal’ quality, its *purity*? That is perhaps the most intriguing aspect of the whole problem: it raises the question, not of the *notion* of ‘pure poetry’ derived from *The Poetic Principle*, but of the example of ‘purity’ found in the poems themselves. With the best of Blake and Coleridge in mind, can we be expected to think of Poe as the exemplar of the pure poet?

Most of us don’t and the injustice, if it is one, must, I think, be due to his inequalities. For he wrote a few poems in which, taken as wholes or in parts, the

¹ Contrast with Lawrence’s judgement this apology made in 1864 by Armand Renaud on behalf of the ‘effets produits par les répétitions’: ‘Il en résulte de cette agglomération de sons semblables une sorte de monotonie, mais monotonie tellement artistique qu’au lieu de causer l’ennui, cela devient quelque chose d’étrange qui fascine et qui berce... La forme matérielle de la

poésie d’Edgar Poe répond précisément à la forme de ses idées; avec d’autres poètes, ce serait puéril et prétentieux, avec lui c’est magique.’ Cited by Lemonnier, op. cit. p. 66. The same superstition or obtuseness about Poe’s value as a technician runs through the whole French tradition of imitation and research, including M. Lemonnier himself.

quintessence has been detected even by some of his most severe critics. The precious nucleus is restricted enough and its constituents would probably be composed somewhat differently by people of differing tastes. Yet, what is important is not to decide how we should pick and choose, but to realize that there were, after all, intelligible reasons for the French recognition of Poe's peculiar merits as a poet—if only they had not been exaggerated!

Baudelaire's final appreciation of his poetry in the *Notes nouvelles* throws light on this point. Its 'powerful effect' he distinguishes from both the ardent effusion of Byron and the harmonious melancholy of Tennyson: 'C'est quelque chose de profond et de miroitant comme le rêve, de mystérieux et de parfait comme le crystal.' His earlier characterizations had erred in assimilating the poems he admired to his own plastic conceptions. Here he has found a formula which is applicable, by no means to all Poe's poems, several of which he misjudged, but to the finer residue; though here again he makes no distinctions. All were 'equally interesting', as he told Vigny.

Baudelaire's dominant attitude is epitomized in Mallarmé's. The claim that the latter's estimate was more acute can scarcely survive an examination of the notes and 'scolies' which accompany his renderings of most of the poems.¹ He admirably hits off Baudelaire's presentation of the personality as 'le suprême tableau à la Delacroix, moitié réel et moitié moral'. But although he scents the exaggeration and suggests that Poe had led the simple and monotonous existence of a man of letters in a country where such a condition was above all a craft, he too joins in the adulation of the poet. If he excludes a few pieces, it is to present only the 'marvels'. He pitches the tone even higher, capping the insistence on 'purity' with the claim that almost each one of a group of twenty pieces is a 'chef-d'œuvre unique'.

But although he participates in the reverential cult, Mallarmé has taken up the challenge implied in his predecessor's conviction that the dream of translating the poems must remain a dream. Profoundly impressed by the task, he presents his versions as an unpretentious *calque*, aimed at rendering what he calls 'quelques-uns des effets de sonorité extraordinaire de la musique originelle et ici et là peut-être le sentiment même'. His notes on the poems deal admittedly with external aspects of their conception or execution and he definitely eschews the critic's task. Many of the points he makes derive from his correspondence with American friends of Poe like Sarah Helen Whitman; and his famous sonnet on Poe is included with translations by Mrs Whitman and another American poetess.

It has been said that Mallarmé's renderings soften the crudities of the originals, and for us they do. But Poe's mannerisms must have been anything but crude for an admirer who could call Annabel Lee 'l'héroïne au nom chantant' and could point to the 'strange alliterative effects' of—

And the yellow-haired young Eulaly (*sic*) became my...

As for his attempt to turn *The Bells*—the only one 'really untranslatable', 'a demon for the translator'—Mallarmé fears that its 'richesse impalpable' (!) will be entirely lost in the operation. *For Annie* inspires a single venture in judgement: 'je dirais que la poésie de Poe n'est peut-être jamais autant allée hors de

¹ *Les Poèmes d'Edgar Poe, traduction de Stéphane Mallarmé, avec portrait et fleuron par Edouard Manet. A Bruxelles chez l'éditeur Edmond Deman, 1888.*

tout ce que nous savons, d'un rythme apaisé et lointain, que dans ce chant.' For *Annie* may be a 'poetic miracle', but it is surely unequal:

And ah! let it never
Be foolishly said
That my room it is gloomy,
And narrow my bed;
For man never slept
In a different bed—
And, to *sleep*, you must slumber
In just such a bed.

In concluding I suggest that the obliviousness to Poe's imperfections, which is the most curious feature in the hallucinated attitude of these most critical minds, may be regarded as the result of a confusion of two interrelated but not identical ideals—the idea of the Pure and the idea of the Perfect. The French tradition is dominated by the idea of the Perfect, which becomes inextricably involved for the poets we are considering in their notion of poetic purity. But the cult of perfection in its modern phase belongs to the Gautier-Baudelaire-Flaubert tradition, coming to its most exigent consciousness in Mallarmé, 'martyr de l'idée du parfait', as his disciple Valéry called him. In origin it is a plastic-Parnassian conception; it has nothing to do with E. A. Poe. His French admirers, however, obsessed with their traditional ideal and unconsciously fusing it with the notion of purity, developed with many elaborations and subtleties from the simple formulae of *The Poetic Principle*, have persistently read it back into Poe's work. Thus his poetry has for Baudelaire 'quelque chose de *parfait* comme le *crystal*'; while for Mallarmé it is 'pur comme le *diamant*'. This retains the notion of the pure, omitted from Baudelaire's final characterization, but assimilates it, as indeed Baudelaire had always done, to one of the accepted symbols of plastic perfection, the jewel, the crystal, the diamond. What is wrong with the whole series of judgments is not so much the perception of purity, which is present, as Mr Spender recently admitted, in 'one or two' of Poe's poems; what is wrong is the persistent implication that Poe is one of the perfect artists.

This may be allowed without depreciating all the consequences of the cult. It seems probable that Baudelaire and his successors apprehended the etherial qualities of English Romanticism through a few of the poems of Poe. Why, we might ask, didn't they become equally excited about Coleridge, Shelley or Keats? Part of the answer, no doubt, would be that none of these had written tales of mystery and imagination. Only De Quincey could compete with Poe in that sense and De Quincey's essays were too personal, too inimitable to take on with anyone but Baudelaire himself. The answer, too, would involve the peculiar tragedy of Poe's life, which Baudelaire and several of the Decadents could tolerably well assimilate to their own. In another point the French estimate was still less mistaken. What Poe had preached he applied: all his poems are free from the extraneous elements he had condemned. Even when entangled in a rhetoric of their own, they are innocent of eloquence.

Yet what appealed to the French poets was probably far less the rare examples of Poe's lyrical quality, glimpsed more often than not through translations that were beginning to multiply, than his theoretic persistence in emphasizing the autonomy of Beauty and his perception of the untrammelled realization of the Poetic Sentiment in music and in poetry conceived as music. It is here we touch the 'greatness' of Poe, in the inerrancy of his premonitions for poetry as well as

in his generous effort to defend poetry as an exercise of the spirit operating on the plane of the ideal, to adapt such a defence to a popular level and to formulate it in the teeth of the moralizing vindictiveness of native hacks and hypocrites. The experiment was effective. Its success almost persuaded the lecturer to return to Richmond, where he had once lived. Yet the response, if consoling, was parochial; it could have given him no inkling of the extraordinary reception that awaited his ideas abroad, once he had shuffled off. The Symbolist movement of 1885 was inspired by a mood not dissimilar from that in which the ill-starred journalist had put together his incongruous notions for the lecture at Richmond—a mood of revolt against the materialism, the utilitarianism, the inveterate ethical rhetoric of nineteenth-century bourgeois mentality, a revolt too against official romanticism, 'la poésie facile', the poetry of comfortable ideas, which fostered and flattered that mentality.

P. MANSELL JONES

BANGOR

THE NAME OF GOD IN GOTHIC

The way from the Many to the One, from the Elohim at the beginning of Genesis to El at the Gospels' end,¹ was long and arduous. But it was not to be left to the Germanic tribes to make their way from the gods to God unaided. The question which exercised those early missionaries who wished to speed the tribes on their way was which short cuts to take. Of all short cuts, and some were as short as St Boniface's through Thor's Oak, none was shorter than the choice of a word for 'God' in the Bible of the Goths.

The Germanic tribes had a generic neuter word for 'god'. In Gothic it was *guþ*. In a language capable of expressing gender no name for the Christian God can by virtue of His Personality and His Fatherhood long remain anything but masculine. But to take the generic neuter *guþ* and make it personal and masculine was an act whose consequences are reflected in all the Germanic tongues of which we have record. Just as the concept of God disengages itself from that of the gods, whether *Vanir* or *Aesir*, so the word for God dissociates itself from its heathen origins in all the ways known to grammar, having, *a priori*, started with number.

In the North, where heathen sources flow into Christian, we can see this happening twice over. Those high gods the *Aesir* were sprung from the sacred pillars of noble halls. As if to show that they had sloughed off their fetish origins their name in Icelandic arrived at a stage where it was distinct from that for 'pillar': *óss* for a god, *áss* for a pillar of wood.² Here again we have *goþ*, a neuter word pre-eminently for 'heathen god', and masculine *guþ* mostly for 'God', a condition reflected in Old English.³ So it was with Gothic. The New Testament in Gothic does not speak of a false god in the singular, although I Corinthians x, 19 gave the translator an opportunity of doing so, but the plurals that do occur and the form of *guþ* meaning 'God' are neuter.⁴

Now owing to a scribal ritual of writing the name of God in Gothic always in contraction there has been no unity among latter-day grammarians as to what the inflected forms would have been if written outright. In only one thing do these schismatics agree: that the solution is to be found in grammar.⁵ One of them at least does pause to heed the evidence of an authority on the names of God (who really solved the problem), but that is merely because he finds support there for his grammatical argument; he agrees for the wrong reason.⁶ I cannot find that

¹ Gen. i, 26; Mark xv, 34 etc.

² A. Noreen, *Altisländische Grammatik*, § 395, where *óss*, 'heathen god', is listed as a *u*-stem with a note to the effect that the form *áss* with the same meaning is an *a*-stem: whereas *óss* in the meaning of 'beam' is *always* an *a*-stem.

³ The issue is clear, in spite of the influence exercised by either form on the other in both languages, producing for example the masc. pl. *godas* for 'false gods' in Old English. On *goþ* and *guþ* see Noreen, op. cit. § 361, '*goþ* (less frequently *guþ*) a heathen (less frequently the Christian) god', a neuter *a*-stem. And § 387, '*guþ* (less frequently *goþ*) God', a masculine *i*-stem with relics of neuter declension: Anm. 1 and 2. Cf. also § 61.1.

⁴ Masculine form would have been *guþs* in nom. and voc.

⁵ W. Streitberg, *Gotisches Elementarbuch*, § 133, expands as *guþ*, *guþs*, *guþa*, and claims the inflected forms as evidence of 'grammatical change' between singular and plural. W. Braune, *Gotische Grammatik*, § 94, Anm. 3, expands as *guþ*, *gudis*, *guda*. S. Feist, *Einführung in das Gotische*, p. 121, reads *guþ*, *guþs*, *guþa*, and like Streitberg and Braune treats *guþ* and *guda* respectively as singular and plural of one and the same word!

⁶ Streitberg, op. cit. § 18, Anm. 3 on Traube, *Nomina Sacra* (1907), whose evidence Braune overrides so far as it concerns *guþ*: op. cit. § 94, Anm. 3. Traube pointed out that sacred names appeared in contraction to preserve them from desecration and that in no language he examined do the contracted forms contain a letter which does not appear in the full form.

it has occurred to anyone to adduce the fact that the name of God breaks clean through the conventions of grammar in Germanic.

In Gothic the word for 'God' appears in all its cases and in some compounds as *gþ*, *gþs* or *gþa*. On the other hand, the false gods occur as *-guda*, *-gude* or *-gudam*. There are some compounds in *guda*-, too, and the isolated form *gudhus*.¹ The task that is being attempted here is to explain how the *þ* comes to be in the dative singular *gþa* (expand *guþa*) against all that historical grammar leads us to expect, and why we find the *gþ* contractions distributed as they are in Wulfila's Bible. On neither of these points has unanimity been reached.

In some of the earliest High German of which we have record we find the word for 'God' already masculine and indeed so personal that it has in its accusative *cotan* an adjectival-pronominal ending peculiar to proper names like those of *Krist* and *Petrus* in *Kristan* and *Petrusan*.² That was a bold attempt, one more consciously bold than the utilization in Icelandic of a bye-form produced by phonetic variation (*guþ* as against *goþ*): and although *cotan* failed to become general in the end, it was an attempt which clearly shows what was being attempted.

It is thus not in itself outrageous to suggest that wherever *gþ*, *gþs* and *gþa* occur in the Gothic Bible they should be expanded (in the mind's eye) to *guþ*, *guþs* and *guþa*. Even those who agree for grammatical reasons seem not to have asked themselves what sort of effect this divergent treatment of the stem *guþ* must have made. In view of what has been said, where even an *óss* can shake off an *áss*, the persistence of the *þ* symbol through the inflexions of *guþ* would seem to have less to do with Verner's than with hieratic law. The troublesome *þ* would appear to be the outcome of conceiving a Person whose nominative, vocative and accusative, etc. were *guþ*, in a way that sought so far as possible to set His name beyond the reach of accident, accident that linked it with the word for gods whose very existence His servants denied. In writing, the Name was revered in a contraction more devout than time-saving (one has only to think of the ritual *XPS* in Greek). It is suggested here that the same spirit was at work in Church usage in speech, generalizing the nominative, vocative and accusative ending *þ* into the inflexions and so setting God apart from the gods.

For this suggestion there is a test nearer to the hearts of grammarians either than the incommunicable spoken test of Sievers (who no doubt read Wulfila's as fluently as Luther's Bible) or the palaeographical test of Traube (eminently communicable and in itself sufficient to end the dispute without further essay). For if, as we suggest, there was a masculine Christian *guþ* with an immutable stem, written *gþ*, *gþs*, *gþa*, and a neuter plural *guda*, we should expect to find this sharp cleavage between them reflected in their respective compounds.

The contracted compounds *gþblostreis* and *gþaskaunein* occur. Are they part of the new Christian vocabulary? The answer seems to be 'yes'. *gþblostreis* closely follows θεοσεβής (John ix, 31), and we may observe that good Christian use is made of the simple heathen *blostreis*, best suited as an equivalent for those who sacrifice in the Old Testament. Again *gþaskaunein* is made in the likeness of θεοῦ μορφή (Philippians ii, 6). It is vain to suggest, as does one devotee of Verner,³ that the original Greek could not have presented the element θεο in contraction here for imitation. The Goths were not Greeks, but barbarians, and ready to out-Greek the Greeks where the Holy Written Name of God was at stake. Thus the only

¹ The contracted *gþa* for 'gods' is discussed below.

² Braune, *Althochdeutsche Grammatik*, § 195, Anm. 1.

³ Streitberg, op. cit. § 133, Anm.

two compounds that contain the Name come under the ban against explicitness. Yet in modern texts and grammars they are expanded *gudblostreis* and *gudaskaunein*, in our opinion to the great perversion of the sense and loss of atmosphere. The effect of *gudaskaunein* at Phil. ii, 6 (a passage delicate enough in all conscience for the Arian Goths) is particularly unfortunate, for it suggests an association with false gods.

Christ Jesus, Who, being in the form of God (*in gudaskaunein*), thought it not robbery to be like God (Arian reading: *galeiko gpa*).

Actually the scribe wrote *gþaskaunein*, and there was no such suggestion.¹

What of the forms in which *guda* does appear, written thus? *εὐλαβής*, the original word for *gudafaurhts*, does not contain the element *θεο* (Luke ii, 25). *Gudalaus* translating *ἄθεος* (Eph. ii, 12) is better off in this respect. But he would be a bold man who would suggest that the Goths had no habitual word for 'god-fearing' or 'godless' before the Gospel came. We need not take leave of *gudafaurhts* and *gudalaus* with that, however. There are two other words whose usage borders on theirs: **gaguþs* (adverb *gagudaba*) and **afguþs*, 'godly' and 'ungodly'. Now these and their abstract nominal derivatives *gagudei*, *afgudei*, are such orderly parallels to *εὐσεβής*, *εὐσεβεια*, *ἀσεβής*, *ἀσεβεια* which they translate, that we may well suspect them of being counterfeits. 'God-fearing' and 'godless' are adequate to express whatever we know of heathen feeling here. But when Christianity came it found not only the want of a word for 'God' but for 'godly' and 'ungodly' too.

There is the odd form *gudhus*. Our concern here is not with the lost *a* at the hinge of the word, but with the spelling *d* in *gud*-. We shall only remark that the reference is to the Jewish Temple, Greek *ἱερόν* (John xviii, 20) served by such as the *gudja* or priest (John xviii, 22 *ἀρχιερεῖ*).²

And so there remains the isolated plural *gþa* (Galatians iv, 8) which we had promised to discuss. *gþa* (*θεοῖς* = gods) is a contraction of the kind we have sought up till now to bring exclusively into relation with the Christian God. *gþa* meaning 'gods' ought to provide the most searching test of our theory.

To the grammarians, whom we have consigned to the void below this essay, *gþa* at Gal. iv, 8 is either a normal³ or abnormal⁴ way of writing *guda*. Those who accept this reading, however, lay themselves open to the charge of not having studied the meaning of Gal. iv, 8 in the light of Wulfila's mission:

Ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods.

This 'service unto them which by nature are no gods' refers (it is in the same verse) to a time when the Galatians 'knew not God'. Now let us read this passage in the Gothic Bible of our own day, offering us *guda*:

akei þan sweþauh ni kunnandans gup, þaim þoei wistai ni sind guda skalkinodeduþ.

The Goths were not 'students of comparative religion'. At this time of conversion the issue for them was between the one true God and the many, false, heathen gods they were asked to forswear. Thus we may safely render this proffered verse as:

But when ye knew not God, ye served those who by nature are not (false) gods.

¹ Of *gþblostreis* Streitberg has the temerity to say as loudly as it can be said in print that the scribe was wrong (*falsch*), op. cit. § 133, Anm., but he recants. See below.

² Cf. Isel. *godði*, 'heathen priest'; *godahrus*, 'heathen temple'.

³ To Braune, *Got. Gramm.* § 94, Anm. 3, all *gþa* are *guda*, everywhere.

⁴ Streitberg, op. cit. § 133, Anm. includes *gþa*, Gal. iv, 8, in his list of contractions which are 'wrong'.

But this utterly overthrows Paul's meaning. What Paul wants is more like:

But when ye knew not God, ye served those who by nature are not (true) gods.

St Paul's thought is a highly elliptical thought. These 'weak and beggarly elements' about which the Galatians were so badly mistaken were thought by them to be gods (but were not). We understand that, secure in his knowledge that there was only one true God, in his poet's command of ellipsis and above all in his shattering negation 'by nature are not', St Paul may write 'gods'. But the simple Goths for whom this Bible was being made could not be expected to follow Paul's thought if their word for 'heathen gods' were used: nor were the priests (who wrote *gþ* in contraction even where the Greeks did not) prepared to take a risk at this point of implying that the Galatians had been serving 'gods who are not false', before they knew God.

What could better express the translator's doubts than *gþa*? To do so involved a contradiction in terms. But that was St Paul's responsibility. In theology the situation was fraught with some peril for them if they found the wrong answer. Far from seeing a mistake in *gþa* at Gal. iv, 8 the writer is inclined to find confirmation of his idea that *gup* with *þ* in all inflexions was a sacred pronunciation: for the *þ* makes its appearance even in a plural as soon as there is a feeling that it, too, may be sacred.

Here it may be objected that if 'gods' at Gal. iv, 8 required *gþa*, then so should 'gods' at John x, 34-5:

Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods? If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken....

The Gothic Bible has *guda* here each time, and the objection has weight. But what we must be on our guard against when discussing such difficulties is finding the text 'wrong', if it can at all be helped. The German scholar repented soon enough of his loud *falsch* over *gþa* at Gal. iv, 8: in a later work *gþa* is *regelrecht* and it is *guda* at John x, 34-5 which is in need of an excuse!¹ We conceive it to be our task not to pit *gþa* at Gal. iv, 8 against *guda* at John x, 34-5, but rather to try to understand how it is possible that they are both as they are, despite our own peevish expectation of them.

Common Germanic teaches us to see the normal plural of the generic word for 'god' in Gothic *guda*, and the situation in which the Goths found themselves, of being evangelized, tells us that the *guda*—in the main their own native gods—were being reassessed according to the values of incoming monotheism, whose Arian form, we are told, was eminently suited to be a stage on the way from polytheism (whether Hellenic or Germanic) to orthodox and catholic Christianity.² The gods thus have two aspects: firstly they are many, and secondly, and because of this, they are false. With *gþa* at Gal. iv, 8 the aspect of falsity was uppermost in the writer's mind for reasons connected with the thought 'by nature are not'. With John x, 34-5 this inkhibition is not active and we have the neuter plural 'which we expect' from the form *galiugaguda* and indeed from considerations of Common Germanic accidence in general.³

If these views are accepted, *gudblostreis*, *gudaskaunein* and *guda* (Gal. iv. 8) will have no right to appear in the next printed Gothic Bible. Nor is there much point in expanding what the Goths for religious reasons contracted. It will also

¹ Streitberg, in his Glossary to his Gothic Bible, 1928, under *Gup*.

² Harnack, *The History of Dogma* (1898), vol. iv, p. 43.

³ Streitberg wishes to excuse *guda*, John x, 34-5, as being in a transferred sense, loc. cit.

follow that we can distinguish the Christian compounds from the pagan. In doing so we shall be reassured by a parallel in Old Icelandic, where neuter *goð* is used by preference for the heathen gods especially in compounds, while again especially in compounds the masculine *guf* is preferred for the Christian God.¹

Indeed, is there any cause for surprise that a concept which could absorb the polytheistic plural Elohim to the later bewilderment of grammarians, should, when laying hold of the Germanic family of languages, extend its unique influence over number to gender, word-ending and word-stem?

¹ Noreen, *op. cit.* § 61. 1.

APPENDIX

NOTE. To aid the reader the following survey of forms is appended. All writers consulted agree as to the occurrence of the forms in the MSS., and the list is therefore probably complete.

(i)					
<i>gþ, gþs, gþa</i>	<i>θεός</i> etc. Nom. voc. acc.; gen.; dat. sing. For <i>θεός</i> throughout in contraction. No exceptions. (Similarly <i>frauja</i> = 'Lord', <i>Iesus</i> , <i>Xristus</i> , abbreviated to <i>fa</i> , <i>is</i> , <i>xs</i> . Cf. Streiberg, <i>Elementarbuch</i> , § 18, Anm. 3: whereas <i>frauja</i> = 'earthly lord', <i>Iesus</i> , the name of a man, <i>galiugaxristjus</i> = 'false Christs', are written out in full.)				
<i>gþblostreis</i>	<i>θεοσεβής</i>	John ix, 31		CA	
<i>gþaskarunein</i>	<i>ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ</i>	Phil. ii, 6		B	
<i>gþa</i>	<i>θεοῖς</i>	Gal. iv, 8	N. pl.	A	
(ii)					
<i>guda</i>	<i>θεοί</i>	John x, 34	N. pl.	CA	
	<i>θεοῦ</i>	John x, 35	A. pl.	CA	
<i>galiugaguda</i>	<i>εἰδωλον</i>	I Cor. x, 19	N. pl.	A*	
	—	I Cor. x, 20	N. pl.	A†	
<i>galiugagude (skalkinassus)</i>	<i>εἰδωλολάτρης</i>	Eph. v, 5	G. pl.	B	
	”	Gal. v, 20	G. pl.	A and B	
	”	Col. iii, 5	G. pl.	A and B	
<i>(du) galiugagudam (gasaliþ)</i>	<i>τὰ εἰδωλόθυρα</i>	I Cor. viii, 10	D. pl.	A	
<i>gudafaurhts</i>	<i>εὐσεβής</i>	Luke ii, 25		CA	
<i>gudalausa</i>	<i>ἄθεος</i>	Eph. ii, 12		A (B illegible)	
<i>gudhusa</i>	<i>ιερῶ</i>	John xviii, 20		CA	

* Here the singular of the original is avoided, the one opportunity offered by that part of the Bible we have in Gothic for showing the word for 'god' (not 'God') in a full form in the singular. Are we to suppose an inhibition here against the form **galiugaguþ*? (To adduce the form *galiugaxristjus* against this supposition loses weight when we remember the secondary importance of Christ before God in the Arian Church.)

† *Galiugaguda* here is in a piece of padding which has no counterpart in the original.

A. T. HATTO

LONDON

HERDER'S PREPARATION OF ROMANTIC THEORY

Two years before Friedrich Schlegel defined Romantic poetry as 'progressive Universalpoesie', there appeared the seventh and eighth series of Herder's *Briefe zu Beförderung der Humanität*. Schlegel read them and reviewed them for Reichardt's periodical *Deutschland*.¹ Sixty years ago Haym made brief reference to their connexion with Romantic thought,² but subsequent criticism has not followed him on this point in any but the most general terms. The *Humanitätsbriefe* have, therefore, not received their due amount of attention, although they contain all the material of which the famous 116th *Fragment* of Schlegel so concisely and suggestively gives the conclusions. Read with their aid, Schlegel's definition moves into clearer perspective. The recondite elusiveness which has come to surround it falls away, and it stands out as a definition of modern, or 'Romantic', poetry, of which the novel, *Roman*, is the representative *genre*. This definition derives from the distinction, upon historical lines, between ancient and modern literature, as set out in *Über das Studium der griechischen Poesie*, a distinction of exactly the same nature as Herder had drawn as early as his *Fragmente*³ and continued in *Über die Wirkung der Dichtkunst*, the *Ideen* and elsewhere, but could not state with Schlegel's programmatic succinctness. Quite apart from any special decisive influence exercised by the *Humanitätsbriefe* upon Schlegel, whose essay *Über das Studium der griechischen Poesie* appeared simultaneously with them, it is valuable to study the general preparation of Romantic theory by Herder, taking the *Humanitätsbriefe* as the culmination of what he had so often presented in previous works. Friedrich Schlegel, it is remembered, had set out under the inspiration of Herder's cry for a 'Winckelmann of Greek literature',⁴ and even if, by reason of their date, the *Humanitätsbriefe* cannot have exercised perhaps quite the effect they should have done, and quite the effect of earlier works by Herder, they must undoubtedly have clinched matters in Schlegel's mind before he proceeded to his own *Fragmente*, by inciting him to give, as Herder did not, concise and enduring conclusions. The absence of such is exactly what the young critic saw to be the defect of the *Humanitätsbriefe*; he was quite impressed by their substance, but deplored their lack of a critical standpoint. Schlegel, brought up on a philosophical as well as an historical training, seems in his review to be wanting to draw the ageing man's conclusions for him, half indulgently, half in irritation. In regard to the definition of the novel, Herder's words seem to be directly responsible for Schlegel's comments on this *genre* as the characteristic modern form of literary expression, and vitally important for the genesis of his observations on *Wilhelm Meister*. In so far as the novel was the starting-point of his concept *Romantisch*, Herder may have played a far more immediately effective role in the growth of Romanticism than is generally recognized.

Following upon the characterization of Greek art and culture as a 'Schule der Humanität' in the sixth series, the seventh and eighth series of the *Humanitätsbriefe* attempt an account of the modern spirit in literature in all its manifestations. Herder names the *Querelle des anciens et des modernes* as his starting-point, criticizing it as being unreal, inasmuch as it concerned itself with the merits of

¹ Friedrich Schlegel, 1794-1802. *Seine Prosaischen Jugendschriften*, hg. von J. Minor (Vienna, 1882), II, 41-8.

² R. Haym, *Herder* (Berlin, 1880-5), II, 631.

³ R. Haym, *Romantische Schule* (5th ed. Berlin, 1928), pp. 215f.

⁴ Herder, *Sämtliche Werke* (ed. Suphan, Berlin), SWS, I, 293; Haym, loc. cit.

personalities rather than with an impartial assessment of the relative values of ancient and modern culture. Poetry, which he defines expansively as the 'Blüte der Kultur und Humanität nach Zeiten und Nationen', or as 'Kultur zum Schönen',¹ changes progressively according to time and place. Greek poetry, he declares in a rather Nietzschean manner, declined as, with the growth of philosophy, religion became outmoded and mythology mythical. A new epoch was opened by the advent of the Christian hymn. In the modern, post-Classical, age, poetry is no longer exclusively national but possesses universal, Christian, characteristics that transcend (but do not swamp) native factors; accent replaces quantity; music becomes an independent rather than a subordinate art; and language, absorbing elements from all the diverse provinces of the Roman Empire, enters upon a stage of confused evolution. The new religion turns men's thoughts away from visible actuality to the hereafter. The world of outward things that antiquity knew, disappears. A new era begins.

The antithesis between ancient and modern, which so forcibly appeared to Friedrich Schlegel, is at once evident. We are faced primarily with an historical distinction.

Two other points of importance for Romantic thought emerge at the same time. The one is the autonomy of music. This, declares Herder very prophetically, is a danger to that development of the totality of human faculties that was his ideal.

Musik ohne Worte setzt uns in ein Reich dunkler Ideen; sie weckt Gefühle auf, jedem nach seiner Weise; Gefühle, wie sie im Herzen schlummern, die im Strom oder in der Flut künstlicher Töne ohne Worte keinen Wegweiser und Leiter finden. Eine Musik, die über Worte gebietet, ist nicht viel anders; sie herrscht despotisch... Auf gleiche Weise kann durch eine geistliche und, wenn man will, eine himmlische Musik die Seele dergestalt aus sich gesetzt werden, daß sie sich, unbrauchbar und stumpf gemacht für dies irdische Leben, in gestaltlosen Worten und Tönen selbst verliert.²

Can Herder have foreseen the extreme outcome of that liberation preached by Josef Berglinger, the musical self-indulgence of the nineteenth century and its far-reaching effects?

The second point is not distantly related to the first. The yearning for things beyond is, says Herder, necessary to man, though the soul cannot live merely on imaginations. The Greeks alone had a strongly developed plastic sense; they alone could render the impalpable palpable. Such a gift comes only occasionally on the earth. The modern age, based upon the Christian cult of the infinite, is, from the start, the age of longing, striving, formlessness, imperfection, desire, suffering.

Dagegen wird bald, hie und da, jene mystische Empfindungs-Theologie ausgesponnen, die, ihrer stillen Gestalt nach ungeachtet, vielleicht die wirksamste Theologie in der Welt gewesen. Im Christentum schlang sie sich dem jüngeren Platonismus an, der ihr viele Zweige der Vereinigung darbot; aber auch ohne Platonismus war sie bei allen Völkern, die empfindend dachten und denkend empfanden, in jeder Religion, die beseligen wollte, am Ende das Ziel der Betrachtung... Der Grund dazu liegt in der Natur des Menschen... So gern möchte er mit Ideen leben und selbst Idee sein... Viele Umstände der damaligen und folgenden Zeit kamen zusammen, diesen Mystizismus zu nähren und ihn dem Christentum, zu welchem er ursprünglich nicht gehörte, einzuverleiben. Ein spekulierender Geist, dem es an Materie zur Spekulation fehlt, ein liebendes Herz ohne Gegenstand der Liebe, gerät immer auf den Mystizismus. Einsame Gegenden, Klosterzellen, Gefängnis und Kerker, endlich auch auffallende Begebenheiten, die Bekanntschaft mit sonderbarlieblichen und bedeutenden Personen, Worte, die man von ihnen gehört, Zeichen der Zeit, die man erlebt hat, u.f., alle diese Dinge brüten den Mystizismus, dies Lieblingskind unsrer geistigen Wirksamkeit und Trägheit,

¹ *SWS*, xviii, 5, 6.

² *SWS*, xviii, 27.

in einer groben oder seidenen Umhüllung aus und geben ihm zuletzt die bunten Flügel des himmlischen Amors. Man liebt, und weiß nicht wen; man begehrt, und weiß nicht was. Etwas Unendliches, das Höchste, Schönste, Beste.¹

Friedrich Schlegel and the other Romanticists were not slow to note this feature of the modern world. Romantic *Sehnsucht* became self-conscious.

With the historic transition came a change of subject and style. In this field, Herder was indebted to Warton, Hurd, Percy, La Curne de Sainte Palaye and others for his remarks. He points to the heroic songs of Teutonic antiquity. He stresses the cultivation, thanks to Arab influence, of *Tapferkeit, Liebe, Andacht*—that trinity of chivalry, love, piety, that was central to his view of the Middle Ages and passed over *en bloc* into Romantic literature; he shows how its influence engendered the *gai savoir* of Provençal culture—that 'romanticization', as he sees it, of all life—with its offshoots in France, Italy and Spain. A further contrast between Classical and post-Classical times emerges. Whereas in Greece poetry grew up side by side with language and taught all wisdom, law and religion, and prose came later, in medieval Europe prose came before poetry and poetry was written to entertain rather than to instruct. The romance, *Roman*, is the form that is characteristic of the Middle Ages. The whole taste of the times was for narrative, *Märchen*, legend, heroic ballad, for adventure, gallantry, chivalry, religion, superstition, magic; and poetry represented this taste. It is proper, therefore, to designate the poems of the times as *romantische Gedichte*—a term Herder applies to *Tristan*, and to the work of Spenser, Ariosto, Shakespeare.² Poetry contains the sum total of all human effort; it is universal, as it was universal in Greece, and must again be in the future. It is for this very reason that Herder regards it as so valuable a source of information concerning the country and epoch to which it belongs.

Wenn Poesie [he writes] die Blüte des menschlichen Geistes, der menschlichen Sitten, ja ich möchte sagen das Ideal unsrer Vorstellungsart, die Sprache des Gesamtwunsches und Sehnsens der Menschheit ist [i.e. exactly 'progressive Universalpoesie' in the Romantic sense]; so dünkt mich, ist der glücklich, dem diese Blüte vom Gipfel des Stammes der aufgeklärtesten Nation zu brechen vergönnt ist... In dieser Rücksicht nun kann man freilich die Geschichte der Dichtkunst, d.i. die Geschichte menschlicher Einbildungen und Wünsche, und wenn ich so sagen darf, des süßen Wahns der Menschheit, der aufs feurigste ausgedruckten Leidenschaften und Empfindungen unsres Geschlechts nicht allgemein und im Großen genug nehmen.³

So Dante provides a sort of encyclopaedia of all human knowledge, in so far as it was available to him in his day, knowledge far different from that possessed by Greek poets. The reference to this poet would not fall on deaf ears among the young Romantic critics.

The whole scope of poetry has grown progressively wider, it is shown, since Classical times, and will continue to do so. That is Herder's first inference at this stage. His second is that literature, while reflecting national and local cultures, nevertheless has certain features common to the whole of Europe, so that modern poetry may, therefore, be regarded as one vast European unit, embracing within itself many individual variations. It may thus be set against Classical poetry, as one unit against another.⁴ Thirdly, Herder does not forget to emphasize the educative value of literature. Life was, indeed, 'poetized' in the Middle Ages in the Romantic sense, according to his conviction.

Und da gerade diese Poesie es war, die auch das Volk nicht verachtete, die sich auf öffentlichen Plätzen und Märkten hören ließ und durch Geist, Witz, Spott eigne

¹ SWS, xviii, 19f.

² SWS, xviii, 77.

³ SWS, xviii, 57f.

⁴ SWS, xviii, 65.

Gedanken und ein freies Urtheil auch über Zeithandel, über die Sitten geistlicher und weltlicher Stände, über das Verhältniß derselben gegen einander weckte; so ward, wie die Geschichte zeigt, Poesie der erste Reformator. Immerhin wird dies auch die fröhliche Wissenschaft (*gaya ciencia*, *gay sabèr*) sein und bleiben.¹

There is in this observation, not only the doctrine of *Volks poesie*, but a good deal of what is behind the Romantic theories of *Transzendental poesie*, *Poesie der Poesie*, and *Romantische Ironie*; for these names are merely labels for the type of poetry which Herder here describes.

All the time we feel there is a silent, but no less eloquent criticism of Herder's own age for not displaying the universality that Classical and medieval literature did. His *Fragmente*, as we shall see, had once explained the reasons for this. Poetry must not be content to stagnate in a mould that is alien to its time, but recognize that it is a growing, developing organism. It must, we feel he wants to say, as he had said in other connexions before, continue upon the lines started in the Middle Ages, from which it has deviated to its detriment. The modern—post-Classical—spirit must express itself in all its fullness in a modern form, not in any other. Modern literature, he seems to indicate, is unique in not reflecting universality. Several circumstances were responsible for this defect, e.g. the doubtful value of the invention of rag-paper and of printing (a point which A. W. Schlegel and Fichte took up). Then came the Reformation, which broke up the unity that had marked medieval culture (Novalis's favourite theme). With the division of the peoples there occurred a division in literature, Catholic countries clinging to old modes, Protestant countries developing a new, reflective manner of writing and leaving behind them the *Ritter- und Feenwelt* of the past. Shakespeare stands on the dividing line between old and new, combining both, a 'darstellender Minstrel', utilizing the whole of English history and the stories and romances and ballads of chivalry, while being also a profound philosopher and commentator on life.

Nun aber wenn er in diesen Scenen der alten Welt uns die Tiefen des menschlichen Herzens eröffnet, und im wunderbarsten, jedoch durchaus charakteristischen Ausdruck eine Philosophie vorträgt, die alle Stände und Verhältnisse, alle Charaktere und Situationen der Menschheit beleuchtet, so milde beleuchtet, daß allenthalben das Licht aus ihnen selbst zurückzustrahlen scheint; da ist er nicht nur ein Dichter der neuern Zeit, sondern ein Spiegel für theatralische Dichter aller Zeiten.²

Thus, each of Shakespeare's plays may be regarded as a 'dargestellter philosophischer Roman', covering all the breadth and depth of human thought and feeling, 'die tiefsten Quellen des Anmutigen, Rührenden, wie andern Theils des Lächerlichen, Ergetzlichen'.³ One can see the shadow of Friedrich Schlegel's words being cast before.

What Herder says concerning the novel deserves to be quoted *in toto*. He bases his remarks solely upon the English novel. For *Wilhelm Meister* he had no time at all.

Keine Gattung der Poesie [he writes] ist von weiterem Umfange, als der Roman; unter allen ist er auch der verschiedensten Bearbeitung fähig; denn er enthält oder kann enthalten nicht etwa nur Geschichte und Geographie, Philosophie und die Theorie fast aller Künste, sondern auch die Poesie aller Gattungen und Arten—in Prosa. Was irgend den menschlichen Verstand und das Herz interessiert, Leidenschaft und Charakter, Gestalt und Gegend, Kunst und Weisheit, was möglich und denkbar ist, ja das Unmögliche selbst kann und darf in einen Roman gebracht werden, sobald es

¹ *SWS*, xviii, 66.

² *SWS*, xviii, 101f.

³ *SWS*, xviii, 108.

unsern Verstand oder unser Herz interessiert. Die größten Disparaten läßt diese Dichtungsart zu; denn sie ist Poesie in Prosa.

Man sagt zwar, daß in ihren besten Zeiten die Griechen und Römer den Roman nicht gekannt haben; dem scheint aber nicht also. Homers Gedichte selbst sind Romane in ihrer Art; Herodot schrieb seine Geschichte, so wahr sie sein mag, als einen Roman; als einen Roman hörten sie die Griechen. So schrieb Xenophon die Cyropädie und das Gastmahl; so Plato mehrere seiner Gespräche; und was sind Lucians wunderbare Reisen? Wie jeder andern haben also auch der romantischen Einkleidung die Griechen Ziel und Maß gegeben. Daß mit der Zeit der Roman einen größern Umfang, eine reichere Mannigfaltigkeit bekommen, ist natürlich. Seitdem hat sich das Rad der Zeiten so oft umgewälzt und mit neuen Begebenheiten auch neue Gestalten der Dinge zum Anschauen gebracht; wir sind mit so vielen Weltgegenden und Nationen bekannt worden, von denen die Griechen nicht wußten; durch das Zusammentreffen der Völker haben sich ihre Vorstellungen an einander so abgereiben, und überhaupt ist uns der Menschen Tun und Lassen selbst so sehr zum Roman worden, daß wir ja die Geschichte selbst beinah nicht anders als einen philosophischen Roman zu lesen wünschen.¹

This passage contains everything that Friedrich Schlegel's *Fragment* says about this genre. There is the same use of the word *romantisch* in the sense of 'that which has to do with the *Roman*, that which is modern and interesting, i.e. post-Classical', the same doctrine of the ever-changing, progressive nature of poetry, with the requirement that it should represent all the universality of life, and the same view that the novel is the typical modern genre and that it alone can express this universality.

The final stage in the *Humanitätsbriefe* is reached when Herder (pointedly ignoring Goethe) cries out for something in German literature that will bear this universal character, and thus achieve what English literature has already achieved. Germany came late, he says, with a note of patriotic envy, self-pity and self-righteousness, because it had been occupied with the task of saving Europe from the Tartars and the Turks. It must make up for lost opportunities, and absorb and make fruitful use of the best from all other sources; and there is more than a hint that it has it in its power to take the lead over all the rest. Since poetry is progressive and changes with the times, why should not its whole future be in Germany's hands? Herder had early discerned in the French Revolution circumstances that he thought might lead to a cultural revival comparable to that of Greece, and though developments in France were disappointing, he did not entirely despair of his own country's learning the necessary lessons. Therefore he writes:

In Sprache und Sitten werden wir nie Griechen und Römer werden; wir wollen es auch nicht sein. Ob aber der Geist der Poesie durch alle Schwüngen und Ekzentritäten, in denen er sich bisher Nationen- und Zeitenweise periodisch bemüht hat, nicht dahin strebe, immer mehr und mehr, so wie jene Grobheit des Gefühls, so auch jeden falschen Schmuck abzuwerfen und den Mittelpunkt aller menschlichen Bemühungen zu suchen, nämlich die echte, ganze, moralische Natur des Menschen, Philosophie des ganzen Lebens? dieses wird mir durch Vergleichung der Zeiten sehr glaubhaft. Auch in Zeiten des größten Ungeschmacks können wir uns nach der großen Regel der Natur sagen: tendimus in Arcadiam, tendimus!²

Unfortunately, Herder's own efforts in the direction of this ideal future were darkened by his personal antipathy towards Goethe and Schiller.

The *Humanitätsbriefe* combine older Herderian themes. The contrast between ancient and modern on historical lines, the idea of progressive development, in literature as in all else, the view of the merely relative value of each epoch, the consideration of the poet as an educator and evangelist, the consciousness of contemporary inadequacy, the belief in Germany's cultural future, the study of

¹ SWS, xviii, 109f.

² SWS, xviii, 140.

world literature in order to seek out its lessons, the new approach to the novel, the assertion that yearning, or striving after an ideal has developed in post-Classical times into a dominating modern characteristic—all these are points he had dealt with, in a greater or lesser degree, in earlier writings. Upon these the Romantic theorists could and did draw liberally.

These topics hang closely together and go back to the one major theme underlying the *Fragmente über die neuere deutsche Literatur*, namely, the characterization of, and declaration of independence of modern German literature; this is the theme the very title suggests. In this sense the *Fragmente* are as important in their sphere as that other Declaration of Independence is in its. Herder made German literature self-conscious. He analysed the modern spirit from the historical standpoint. German literature was, therefore, made aware, from the very beginning of its modern revival, of the contrast between ancient and modern, Classic and Romantic, and grew up in this awareness.

So gären griechisch-römisch-nordisch-orientalisch-hellenistische Dämpfe ganze Jahrhunderte; sie brausen gewaltig auf, die Hefen sinken endlich langsam, und nun! was ist ausgegärt? ein *neuer* moderner Geschmack in Sprachen, Wissenschaften und Künsten. Habe ich wider die Geschichte geredet?—Nein!... Ist das wundersame Bild ein Traum, das ich in meiner Einbildung vor mir sehe, und das auf seiner Stirn den Namen trägt: 'Neuere Literatur der Völker'? Es ist ein großer Kolossus, sein Haupt von orientalischem Golde, das meinen Blick tötet, weil es die Strahlen der Sonne zurückwirft; seine hochgewölbte Brust glänzt vom griechischem Silber; sein Bauch und Schenkel festes römisches Erz, seine Füße aber sind von nordischem Eisen mit gallischem Ton vermischt—ein ungeheueres Wunderwerk der Welt: die Anbetung eines Volks, das Geschöpf langer Jahrhunderte und Geschlechter, ein prächtiger, unabsehbarer Anblick; sein Haupt ragt über die Wolken; mein Auge erhebt sich kaum bis an seine Brust und fällt matt zum Boden zurück; ich falle nieder und bete an!...¹

Herder accordingly deprecates the manner in which imitation of Classical subject and style 'poisoned' modern literature, for thanks to it, not only must modern ideas be forced into non-modern modes of expression, but the very growth of these ideas is itself hindered and all real life cramped.

O das verwünschte Wort: klassisch!... Das Wort 'klassisch' ists gewesen, das den Ausdruck vom Gedanken und den Gedanken von der ihn erzeugenden Gelegenheit gesondert, das uns gewöhnt hat, nach Horaz Exerzitien zu machen und ihn in seiner Sprache übertreffen zu wollen. Dies Wort wars, das alle wahre Bildung nach den Alten, als nach lebenden Mustern, verdrängte und den leidigen Ruhm aufbrachte, ein Kenner der Alten, ein Artist zu sein, ohne daß man damit höhere Zwecke erreichen dürfte; dies Wort hat manches Genie unter einen Schutt von Worten vergraben, seinen Kopf zu einem Chaos von fremden Ausdrücken gemacht und auf ihn die Last einer toten Sprache wie einen Mühlstein gewälzt; es hat dem Vaterlande blühende Fruchtbäume entzogen; da stehen sie nun auf fremdem Boden und trauern mit halbverwelkter Blüte und siakenden Blättern, statt daß sie uns Bäume hätten sein sollen, unter denen ihr Geschlecht wohnen könnte.²

Thought and expression must be one, modern literature must express the whole of modern life, otherwise all thought, language, taste and culture will wilt away. Poets must be representative of all the content of their age and nation. That is what a proper study of the Greeks will tell us, if embarked upon by a 'Winckelmann of Greek literature'.³ The frequentation of another nation's style cramps originality unless it be undertaken in the frame of mind that wishes to understand and emulate.

This was a striking enough beginning. It came before most of the Romanticists were born, indeed before any similar Romantic programme in any European

¹ *SWS*, I, 363f.² *SWS*, I, 412.³ *SWS*, I, 293.

literature. As Herder's thought widened from its purely literary beginnings towards a general historical survey of mankind, the points he made acquired depth. The doctrine of originality in literature became the doctrine of originality in life. Mankind must at all times, he taught, realize itself in all its fullness, cultivate and express all its manifold potentialities at all times. Each age carries its own purpose in itself, and must assert itself in its own way. All human life is progression, development, as the essay *Über den Ursprung der Sprache* says in words not unlike Schlegel's:

Nie ist (der Mensch) der ganze Mensch, sondern immer in Entwicklung, im Fortgange, in Vervollkommenung... Das Wesentliche unsres Lebens ist nie Genuß, sondern immer Progression, und wir sind nie Menschen gewesen, bis wir—zu Ende gelebt haben.¹

By the time the essays in *Von Deutscher Art und Kunst* are reached, the contrast between ancient and modern is included in the antithesis between *Naturpoesie* and *Kunstpoesie*, and illustrated by the parallel between the Greek and English dramas. So Homer, the minstrel, is the colleague of the scalds and bards, and Shakespeare is the brother of Sophocles. All of them expressed the culture, traditions, religion, history, manners, mythology, ideas and sentiments of their age and time. If Shakespeare wrote *Universalpoesie*, as Schlegel would have said, reflecting every phase of contemporary human experience, why, asked Herder, could not modern Germany produce a dramatist who could do the same? He demands that unity of poetry and life which existed in Greece and the Middle Ages and on which the greatness of English literature was built, that full vitality of native tradition which was embodied in the folk-song, that rich variety and unspoilt and unrestricted range of poetic experience, that nearness to nature and actuality which conventionalism and a false approach to the Classics had destroyed. The result would be to make literature representative of the whole of the modern spirit. In this sense Novalis planned his series of novels.

At this point Herder begins to make real use of the word *romantisch*. He speaks of 'romantisches Abenteuer',² or the 'romantische Denkart'³ of the Middle Ages, and means 'of the type occurring in medieval romances'. At times the word is almost synonymous with 'poetic', as the Romanticists held it to be later; at times it means 'fantastic', 'having to do with chivalry or adventure'. The *Reisejournal* had merely spoken of the *Romangeist* of the Normans;⁴ Herder later refers to their 'romantischer Charakter'.⁵ Other references are made to 'romantische Liebe',⁶ 'romantische Rittergeist',⁷ 'romantische Gedichte',⁸ 'das romantische Land der Schwärmer' (i.e. Spain).⁹ Herder's application of the term to landscape has already been noted by Grimm's *Wörterbuch*.¹⁰

The next major stage after *Von Deutscher Art und Kunst*—and, we may add, after the picture of the Middle Ages drawn in *Auch Eine Philosophie*—is reached in *Über die Wirkung der Dichtkunst*, a work which merits more attention than is generally realized. It is a document of first importance in the growth of Romantic theory. It distinguishes sharply between ancient poetry (now defined as that of the Hebrews, Greeks, Romans and 'Northern Nations') and the poetry of medieval and modern times. The whole essay is divided up according to this distinction.

¹ SWS, v, 98.

² SWS, v, 523.

³ SWS, ix, 524.

⁴ SWS, iv, 430. Cf. also xxxii, 30.

⁵ SWS, xviii, 462.

⁶ SWS, viii, 398.

⁷ SWS, xiv, 444.

⁸ SWS, xviii, 77. Vide supra, p. 254.

⁹ SWS, xviii, 348.

¹⁰ Cf. also L. Pearsall Smith, *Four Words* (Society for Pure English, Tract xvii) (Oxford, 1924), and R. Ullmann and H. Gotthard, *Geschichte des Begriffes 'Romantisch' in Deutschland* (Berlin, 1927), passim.

The initial description of the poet as a 'Dolmetscher der Natur' or 'Bote der Schöpfung'¹ leads to the corollary that poetry must universalize itself, as it always did in the past, so as to represent the whole of Creation; and since Creation is itself always growing and developing, so must poetry do the same. There is always present in Herder's mind the thought that no contemporary poet merited such a magnificent description as 'Bote der Schöpfung'.

So lange [runs an instructive passage] ein Mensch noch unter Gegenständen der Natur lebt und diese ihn ganz berühren, je mehr er Kind dieser lebendigen, kräftigen, viel-förmigen Natur ist, an ihren Brüsten liegt, oder sich im ersten Spiele mit seinen Mit-brüdern, ihren Abdrücken und seinen Nebenzweigen auf Einem Baume des Lebens freut; je mehr er ganz auf diese wirkt und sie ganz auf sich wirken läßt, nicht halbiert, meistert, schnitzelt, abstrahiert; je freier und göttlicher er, was er empfangen hat, in Sprache bringen kann und darf, sein Bild von Handlungen ganz darstellt und durch die ihm eingeborne, nicht aufgeklebte Kraft wirken läßt; endlich je treuer und wahrer die Menschen um ihn dies alles empfangen, aufnehmen, wie ers gab, in seinen Ton gestimmt sind und Dichtkunst auf seine, des Dichters, nicht auf ihre, der respektiven Zuhörer, Weise wirken lassen: da lebt, da wirkt die Dichtkunst: und gerade ist dies in den Zeiten der ganzen wilden Natur, oder auf den ersten Stufen der politischen Bildung.²

The old contrast of *Naturpoesie* and *Kunstpoesie* remains. The future topics of the *Humanitätsbriefe* are all raised in turn, the theme being, in both works, that literature, being no longer expressive of all life, is no longer the educative agent that it was in the beginning, in Greek and Hebrew times, no longer the transmitter of all wisdom and history. At one point Herder's terminology suggests that the whole of early Greek life was 'poetized', dominated by poetry, rather as the whole of modern life was to be dominated by Romantic poetry according to the theory of the rising generation.³ Literature must recapture this supreme position that it once held; the poet must again be a 'Bote der Götter'. In his striking way Herder maintained that the songs of the Teutonic past changed the whole face of Europe!⁴

Crossing the dividing line between ancient and modern, Herder turns to the Middle Ages. The conception of Europe as a cultural unit, put forward in *Auch Eine Philosophie* and prepared in the *Fragmente*, recurs, as it also does in the *Ideen*. The picture of the Middle Ages that he draws in these works embraces romances, legends, *Märchen*, the whole colourful age of chivalry, kings and knights, popes and beggars, monks and maidens in distress, *jongleurs* and crusaders. Poetry, he declared, represented all this. Dante's work is described, as we have seen it described in the *Humanitätsbriefe*, as a vast encyclopaedia of all his knowledge and experience, universal in the fullest sense. 'Wenn also eine Poesie der neuern Zeiten Wert hat, so müßte es diese sein,' he asserts,⁵ and proceeds to make a concluding protest against the utter lack of such literature in his own time and country. Here he was faced with his old problem as to how poetry could exist without appropriate cultural conditions for its growth, and how, on the other hand, the decadent times could be revived unless great poetry existed. The Romantic school had the same dilemma before it, and thought that it found the answer in *Transzendentalpoesie* or *Poesie der Poesie*, i.e. poetry that deals, as transcendental philosophy does, with the relation of the real to the ideal and, as it does so, reflects not only upon this relationship, but upon itself as well and its function.

The breakdown of modern literature came, as Herder said so often, with the Renaissance, when men strove to write 'Classically', and poetry became the affair

¹ SWS, VIII, 340.

⁴ SWS, VIII, 389.

² SWS, VIII, 341 f.

⁵ SWS, VIII, 405.

³ SWS, VIII, 369.

of scholars and pedants and degenerated into a means of enjoyment rather than of education. The old oneness of poetry and life was lost. Herder's standpoint was affected by his low opinion of his own country's literature. He set out to tell what poetry once had been and was no more. The conclusion that it must represent all the range of human experience, past and present (so that it will include 'Classical' poetry within itself), that it must be progressive and universal, was left to Schlegel to draw. Herder does little more than hint at it in passing; it is what he meant, but did not say—did not say, at least, in any precise form. He was more concerned with describing than with elaborating a programmatic doctrine. He was an historian, first and foremost. Poetry was merely a part of his main theme, which was the history of all human effort.

His two other prize essays of those same years take his thought a little nearer to that of Friedrich Schlegel. He claims, for instance, that literary instruction should precede philosophical study in education, so that any lack of balance in the rationalistic direction may be avoided in the mind's structure. In the days when poets and philosophers were one, teaching all wisdom, the problem did not arise. The doctrine of the 'poetization' of life is merely an extension of this. It becomes more and more clear that Herder desires a modern revival in the Greek sense. We cannot recall Greece, but we can and must emulate its greatness in our own way. That is why so much attention is devoted to Greece in the *Ideen* and elsewhere; that is why Herder desired circumstances that would facilitate the free production of literature, and why he welcomed the French Revolution with its dream-like prospects of a new revival.

The last major account of the modern spirit before the *Humanitätsbriefe* was given in the *Ideen*. The material is again substantially the same. The conception of Europe as a vast unit, with a spirit of its own, once more emerges.¹ Disparate elements were reconciled—and enslaved, as he does not fail to add in admiration of Gibbon—by the Church. Herder opens up in this compendious work the whole field of human history, in all its change, variety, endeavour, unrest, the entire range of man's experience on earth and speculation concerning the hereafter—the very substance, he said, that should be the subject of poetry. The decisive influence of the Teutonic nations is stressed yet again, and we feel that there is more than a hint of A. W. Schlegel's designation of Germany as the 'Orient' of Europe, in his remarks upon the past, present and future of his country. The rise of chivalry, from Teutonic origins through Arab developments, is repeated, with its consequent 'romanticization' of life in ballads, *contes*, *fabliaux* and romances, those indispensable forerunners of Shakespeare and Cervantes. The book breaks off on the threshold of the Renaissance, but not before a sketch has been drawn of all the throbbing energy and activity of the Middle Ages, from the irruptions of the barbarians to the introduction of gunpowder and brandy and the invention of rag-paper. No more complete or interesting account of the world could have faced the young Romanticists in the years of adolescence.

Finally, there is Herder's point that striving for an ideal of perfection transcending the inadequacies of actuality is a specially marked feature of the post-Classical world. It is at the basis of his doctrine of *Humanität*. The *Ideen*, *Gott, Christliche Schriften*, *Zerstreute Blätter* and *Humanitätsbriefe* all deal with it at length and illustrate it from various angles. It links Herder with the doctrines of *Faust* as well as those of the *Athenäum*. He looked forward to an all-embracing rebirth, a *Palingenesie*, as he called it, of the whole of human culture. Modern

¹ *SWS*, xiv, 258, 287.

civilization must be as complete in its way as Greek civilization, the highest known, was in its. Every element in human life must find a place within a harmonious, symmetrical unity. Herder found ever-new symbols for his doctrine. It is the renewal of the tree in the springtime, dawn after night, awakening after slumber, evolution, regeneration. It is, he declares, in the very nature of things. There is a gradation of being in all the universe, ordained by Providence, and mankind must make the pilgrimage through every phase in turn. The goal can never be fully attained in this world. Man learns as he lives. Striving is the gift of heaven. 'Trägheit ist die Erbsünde des Menschen.'¹ Without striving man's fate will resemble that of the unhappy handmaidens in the *Helenatragödie*, who, being incomplete personalities, merge at the end with nature, losing their identities and starting upon entirely different existences, to make up for their failure. The Faustian doctrine of activity is combined with no little *Weltschmerz*, a wistful optimism is accompanied by a dangerous fatalism. With each stage man marches forward towards a fresh realization of that goal that ever recedes, 'der Charakter unsres Geschlechts, . . . das Ziel unsres Bestrebens, die Summe unsrer Übungen, unser Wert, . . . der Schatz und die Ausbeute aller menschlichen Bemühungen, die Kunst unsres Geschlechts'.² Literature must at all times mirror this. Mephistopheles's crooked logic was not at fault when he recommended Faust to league himself with a poet, if it was universality of experience that he desired.

Herder's Romanticism is not quite what is commonly understood as such. He taught that life was not a bitter, frustrated struggle, but a joyful, hopeful endeavour, once the consciousness is gained of its value and strength. Failure comes if this consciousness be lacking. His doctrine was one, not of anguished disillusion or despairing renunciation, but of harmonious, co-operative effort, utilizing and developing every factor in human existence. He criticized, and criticized savagely, but he gave an answer, too. It is an answer that places him nearer to the man of the *fröhliche Wissenschaft* than to *Childe Harold*. His answer, however full it is of repetitions and uncertain modulations, is stated in a major, not a minor key.

A. GILLIES

HULL

¹ *SWS*, xiv, 567.

² *SWS*, xvii, 138.

ANGLO-DANISH LITERARY RELATIONS 1867-1900

THE FORTUNES OF DANISH LITERATURE IN BRITAIN¹

1. INTRODUCTORY

The omens for the reception of Danish literature in Great Britain were at the outset favourable. The public had Denmark vividly in mind, partly by reason of the war of 1864 and the defeat of the Danes (with whom sympathy mostly lay), partly because the newly married, beautiful and popular wife of the Prince of Wales, Alexandra, was the daughter of Christian IX, King of Denmark since 1863. In the realm of literature, moreover, Denmark presented in Hans Andersen the foreign author who probably had the largest following in England, where he was personally known. Prior's and Buchanan's recent collections of Danish ballads in English² had opened up a large and novel vista; Mary and William Howitt's *Literature and Romance of Northern Europe*³ brought the story down to the nineteenth century; and, in addition, Mrs Bushby's anthology of short stories and the like, *The Danes Sketched by Themselves*,⁴ had given some notion of the output of contemporary Danish writers.

2. EDMUND GOSSE AND WILLIAM ARCHER

It was fortunate for Danish literature that two of the most influential and well-informed of the British literary publicists, perfectly familiar with its vehicle, made it the subject of some of their writings and gave the names of its modern representatives a currency which the literature only of France and of Norway, and perhaps also of Russia and of Germany, could exceed.

R. H. Hutton, then editing *The Spectator*, turned the eager, but unsettled mind of young Edmund Gosse (1849-1928, knight of the Dannebrog, 1912) to Danish literature: 'Choose something out of the way, Scandinavian literature for instance, and you will get a hearing.'⁵ In 1872, accordingly, and again in 1874, Gosse travelled to Copenhagen, stayed for some weeks either time in the household of Dr Bruun Juul Fog⁶ (at that time *provst* of Holmenkirken and later bishop, successively, of Aarhus and Sjælland) to perfect his Danish and become acquainted with living Danish authors. He heard Grundtvig deliver his last sermon, saw 'Carit Etlar' and, among many others, met Carl Andersen, Hans Christian

¹ I endeavour herewith to give a sketch of the knowledge and appreciation of the literature of Denmark in the United Kingdom during this third of a century. The lines of circumscription have not always been easy to draw; where there was doubt, I have inclined to inclusiveness rather than exclusiveness. I ask the pardon of any whom I may offend by dealing here with Holberg, Hauch and others of Norwegian birth. A companion study on the fortunes of English literature in Denmark is well advanced, but cannot be completed until it becomes possible to visit Denmark.

² Prior, R. C. A., *Ancient Danish Ballads* (3 vols. 1860), translations, with a full introduction. Buchanan, R. W., *Ballad Stories of the Affections, from the Scandinavian* (1866), all, I believe, translated from the Danish, including

some modern specimens from Erik Bøgh, Høedt, Jørgen Christian Grønvold Juul, P. L. Møller, Cehlenschläger and Claudius Rosenhoff.

³ 1852.

⁴ Bushby, Mrs Anne S., *The Danes Sketched by Themselves* (3 vols. 1864) contains the editor's translations of three anonymous pieces, two from Hans Christian Andersen, one from Baggesen, three from Carl Bernhard, two from Blicher, three from 'Carit Etlar', one from H. P. Holst, five from Ingemann, one from Cehlenschläger, one from E. Storm, and one from Winther; there were some Swedish items too.

⁵ Charteris, E., *Life and Letters of Sir Edmund Gosse* (1931), p. 39.

⁶ Whose obituary he wrote briefly in *Athenaeum*, I (1896), 314.

Andersen, Bødtscher, Edvard Brandes, Drachmann, Molbech, Frederik Paludan-Müller, Ploug, Ernst von der Recke, Henrik Scharling, bishop Martensen, the art expert Julius Lange, the publisher Frederik Hegel, George Stephens, the professor of English, and struck up a warm friendship with Georg Brandes. The lively and substantial account of his experiences was published in 1911, *Two Visits to Denmark 1872-1874*.

On his return to England, Gosse inscribed the collection of verse, *On Viol and Flute* (1873),¹ 'Til alle mine Venner i Norden Hilsen og Tak', adding the stanza

Er jeg en Sanger, saa bør jeg jo vide
Kjærligheds smigrende Lyst;
Alt, hvad et Hjerter kan rumme og lide,
Burde jo tolke min Røst;

he used the history of Erik Eiegod for his five-act blank-verse tragedy *King Erik* (1876); and he included memorial verses, 'Hans Christian Andersen, 1805-75', in his *New Poems* (1879). He also began contributing to British periodicals a great number of articles² on Danish literature and the like, to which detailed reference will be made further on: eleven to *The Academy* before 1880 (two thereafter), two to *The Athenaeum* (four between 1881 and 1900), one to *The Cornhill Magazine* (1874), and one to *Temple Bar* (1880). Some of this material went to make up the volume, *Studies in the Literature of Northern Europe* (1879),³ in which two chapters were devoted to Denmark, viz. 'The Danish National Theatre' and 'Four Danish Poets'. Gosse also delivered a lecture, which was printed with the ensuing discussion, on *The Ethical Condition of the early Scandinavian Peoples* (1875).

This activity was at its height in the 1870's. Dr Fog's conservatism made it difficult for his young visitor to become acquainted with the junior writers, and, as the older generation died off, Gosse allowed other interests somewhat to take the place of the Danish. He found room for only one Danish novel⁴ in Heinemann's *International Library*. In 1900, however, he wrote an Introduction to H. L. Brækstad's new translation of *Fairy Tales of Hans Christian Andersen*.⁵ As departmental editor of the 10th edition (1902-3) and chief literary adviser of the 11th edition (1910-11) of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, he ensured proper treatment of Danish literature,⁶ on which, besides some anonymous notices, he had compiled the general article, 'Denmark, Literature',⁷ for the 9th edition (1875-89); this gives an adequate and coherent account up to and including Ehlerschläger, with a few more disjointed sentences on each of the outstanding writers of more recent date.

The continued interest taken in Danish literature during the period was due, more than to any other, to Gosse; though his parallels would not command universal consent, particularly valuable were the resemblances which he found between the Danish writers of whom he treated and others, better known, in the history of English or French literature.

William Archer (1856-1924)⁸ took more interest in Norwegian literature than

¹ One of the poems in it is 'Spillende Genier. A Bas-Relief of Thorwaldsen's'.

² Presumably there were also unsigned articles at this time which I have not always attempted to identify as by Gosse.

³ The second edition (1883) is a reprint; in *Northern Studies* (1890), only the Scandinavian chapters were reissued (with a second essay on Ibsen).

⁴ Jacobsen's *Niels Lyhne* (*Siren Voices*).

⁵ In 1925 Gosse acted as co-editor of *The Oxford Book of Scandinavian Verse*.

⁶ All but one of the initialled articles on Danish literary subjects in the 11th edition were by Gosse.

⁷ VII (1877); 'literature' is taken in a very wide sense.

⁸ Aas, L., *W. Archer* (being an excerpt from *Atlantis* (1920)) says nothing about Archer's dealings with Denmark.

in Danish. In his life-long plans for a British National Theatre,¹ the organization of the Kongelig Theater at Copenhagen was always present to him, and on it he wrote 'The Royal Danish Theatre' for *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* for 1892,² by no means neglecting the native repertory; to the more modern portion of the latter he devoted the paper in *The Fortnightly Review* for 1890, which will be mentioned again. He co-operated in and supervised the translation of Brandes's *William Shakespeare* (1898) and wrote short introductions to the English versions of his *Henrik Ibsen*, *Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson* (1899).³

3. GENERAL SURVEYS

The first of the more general surveys in this period is 'Denmark—its History and Literature', an anonymous contribution to Sharpe's *London Magazine* for 1867,⁴ which, after declaring that 'the literature of Denmark is very rich', goes on to give a very poor idea of it, with perfunctory and inaccurate references to Holberg, Ewald, Ehlenschläger, Winther, Hertz, H. C. Andersen, Molbech and Grundtvig. Yet even this compares favourably with somewhat under a page which 'A Dane' devoted to literature while describing the 'Danish National Character' in *Temple Bar* for 1870;⁵ he makes some almost worthless observations on H. C. Andersen and 'Ochlenschlager' and remarks, as pleasantly as truthfully, 'You have scarcely heard the names of Pleiberg, Plancer, Plesby and Ingomarr.'⁶

The annual⁷ summaries of Continental literature, which *The Athenaeum* began to print in 1869, included as a general rule⁸ a section on Denmark; it was contributed anonymously in 1869 and 1870; in 1871 and 1872 by Jon Sigurdson; in 1873 and 1874 by E. Jessen; in 1875, 1876 and 1877 by Adolf Hansen; from 1878 to 1891 by Viggo Petersen; and from 1893 onwards by Alfred Ipsen.⁹ In accordance with the general principles of the *Athenaeum* surveys, they concerned themselves with non-bellevistic as well as with imaginative literature, and only Hansen and Ipsen attached preponderating importance to the latter. However, not even these two indulged in extravagant claims for the material before them. All are conscientious in recording everything of note and endeavour to value it fairly. Except Ipsen, they succeed. He is a partisan, an ardent admirer of Jørgensen and a depreciator (as is well known) of Georg Brandes. In 1898, when he has the odd caprice of calling Einar Christiansen, the playwright and theatrical manager, 'our first literary critic', he delivers himself of a long congratulatory sermon on the failure of Brandesianism ('Georg Brandes himself called it naturalism'¹⁰), which has issued in 'moral anarchy and despondency'.

¹ Cf. *A National Theatre* (1907; in collaboration with H. Granville-Barker).

² xxiii, 451.

³ Later, he wrote 'Ludvig Holberg: with special reference to *Jeppe paa Bjerget*' in *Edda*, xxv (1925).

⁴ N.S. xxx, 290.

⁵ xxviii, 436.

⁶ The first of these is Holberg, the last presumably Ingemann; who the other two are meant to be I cannot guess.

⁷ Until 1884 'Continental Literature' appeared at the very end of every year; in 1886 and 1887 in the first number of the new year (so none was actually printed in 1885); in the summer of 1887 (when the review accordingly covered six months only) the date was moved to the first number in July. The experiment in 1869 was divided into

two portions; the second, which included the section on Denmark, being held over to January 1870.

⁸ There were none for 1881 and 1891-2.

⁹ None of the named writers was British, and there are no grounds for assuming that the writers of the first two summaries were. As they were to convey a kind of 'agreed opinion' to foreign audiences, these accounts would be as valuable for the study of literary taste in Denmark as they are for computing the information about Danish literature available to English readers.

¹⁰ This was a very ingenious *suggestio falsi* for misleading English readers into thinking Brandes a champion of *le naturalisme*; most of them could not know that, to Brandes, one of the greatest of 'naturalists' was William Wordsworth.

Gosse's general article, 'Scandinavian Literature' in *The Academy* for 1875,¹ contains, *inter alia*, short notices of *Billeder og Sange* by Richardt (who in some ways, he says, resembles Christina Rossetti and is 'worthy of the laurel'), Schandorph's *Goldoni og Gozzi* ('a learned and very able critical study') and Drachmann's *I Storm og Stille* ('the stories are... full of talent, but the vehemence and redundancy of thought need to be more carefully kept in check before the author can be praised without reserve').

In 1879 *The Academy* printed an article from the pen of Georg Brandes² on 'New Danish and Norwegian Poetry',³ praising the vigour of literature in the North and, among the Danes, singling out Jacobsen (who is ranged with Keats), Drachmann, Schandorph (for the 'great freshness of diction and humour'), Erik Skram (whose *Gertrude Coldbjørnsen* is 'daring') and 'Epigonos' (Gjellerup).

Miss E. C. Otté, who was responsible for the volume *Denmark and Iceland* (1881) in the series 'Foreign Countries and British Colonies', gave⁴ a seven-page sketch of Danish literature from Valdemar's Laws and Harpestreng to Georg Brandes.

H. H. Boyesen, a Norwegian, who held a professorship at Columbia College, New York, wrote mainly for North American readers, but his *Essays on Scandinavian Literature* (1895) had a London edition too. It contains chapters on Hans Christian Andersen, who is treated in a slightly depreciatory tone as a representative of 'the softness, the sweetness, the juvenile innocence of Danish romanticism', on 'Contemporary Danish Literature' and on Georg Brandes, whom the writer puts in the same class of critics as Lessing, Matthew Arnold and Taine, superior to Sainte-Beuve in his writing on Ibsen and to Vogüé in what he has to say about the Russian novelists, though he has been regrettably seduced by notions of sexual emancipation and by enthusiasm for 'an obscure German iconoclast named Friedrich Nietzsche [*sic*]'. This paper and that on Andersen give all the suitable biographical data. The champion of breezy Bjørnson finds contemporary Danish Literature (apart from Brandes) rather spineless; he appraises briefly H. F. Ewald (with his 'direfully conventional romanticism'), Bergsøe ('an author of a much higher order'), Goldschmidt (who 'stands the test of time remarkably well'), Schandorph (compared with Jacobsen and Drachmann he 'seems altogether the maturest mind and furnishes the most finished and satisfactory work'), Jacobsen (praised as a colourist but not for much else), Drachmann (who, though *Der Var Engang* and *Forskrevet* are ignored, receives much praise, even if 'like most people with a fine voice, he is tempted to sing too much').

The international magazine *Cosmopolis* did not neglect the 'extraordinary productiveness' of contemporary Scandinavian authors:⁵ R. N. Bain⁶ contributed three articles entitled 'Contemporary Scandinavian Belles-Lettres' (or the like) in 1896, in 1897 and in 1898 respectively.⁷ Danish literature absorbs only a fraction of his attention, but he manages to give a full and discriminating account of it; his predilections are for that 'remarkable group of young Danish writers, the New Romantics, as they are sometimes called', Jørgensen, Stuckenberg, Claussen, Michaelis; yet Georg Brandes receives the highest possible praise for his writing on Shakespeare and Heine, and a writer neglected elsewhere, Karl Larsen, comes in for kind appreciation.⁸

¹ VIII, 378.

² XVI, 266. He had contributed 'German Literature' to XIV (1878), 294.

³ This caused some annoyance in Denmark (cf. G. Brandes, *Levned*, II (1907), 333).

⁴ p. 58.

⁵ IV, 355.

⁶ To Bain's competence in 'nordiske Sprog' Georg Brandes pays testimony in his 'Indtryk fra London' (*Samlede Verker*, XI (1902), 308).

⁷ IV, 355; VIII, 66; XI, 673.

⁸ VIII, 74 and XI, 683.

'Denmark and Germany', translated for *The Contemporary Review* of 1899¹ from Georg Brandes, alludes quite copiously to Danish literature, to its folk-songs, for instance, to Kierkegaard, to Blicher, to Drachmann, to Jacobsen, to Grundtvig and to Cehlenschläger.

The 'International Library of Famous Literature' (1899) had only five translated excerpts from Danish literature, three pieces from Andersen and one each from Cehlenschläger and Georg Brandes.

A line drawn after 1900 cuts the issue of the volumes of 'The Periods of European Literature'² into two halves. Danish literature receives scanty treatment in the volumes of the earlier half. Thus Gregory Smith omits the Danish ballads (though two footnotes attest his knowledge of their existence) from his long chapter 'The Problem of the Ballads and Popular Songs' in *The Transition Period* (1900), and, though T. S. Omond, in *The Romantic Triumph* (1900), says³ that 'A country which contributed Thorwaldsen, Cehlenschläger and Andersen to the common stock must be credited with no small influence on the imaginative literature of Europe', he could only give a little over two pages to them and their contemporaries, among whom he mentions Rask, Sandøe, the two Ørstedes, the elder Molbech, Madvig, Baggesen, Møller, Ingemann, Hauch and Grundtvig. Elton's *Augustan Ages* (1899), by contrast, has some capital paragraphs on Holberg,⁴ says something about Leonora Christina's *Jammers-Minde* and rather less about Bording, Falster and Stub.

4. THE CLASSICS AND ANCIENT LITERATURE OF DENMARK

The Danish classics, established as such in British opinion by 1867, were Holberg, Cehlenschläger and Ingemann.⁵ Of the last-named, who had had a fair hearing in the generation before, nothing more transpired except Sabine Baring-Gould's translation of 'Through the Night of Doubt and Sorrow'⁶ and some similar items in Tait's *Hymns of Denmark* (1868).

The knowledge and appreciation of Cehlenschläger were not much enhanced either.⁷ *Axel og Valborg*, of which already three English translations existed, was again (as *Axel and Valborg* each time) turned into blank verse by H. W. Freeland (1873)⁸ and P. Butler (1874),⁹ while *Hakon Jarl*, familiar too, appeared as *Earl Hakon the Mighty* (translated by F. C. Lascelles) in 1874. The general accounts of Danish literature and Gosse's and Archer's considerations of the Kongelig Theater's repertory could not but bring him in, but the only substantial additions to knowledge of Cehlenschläger were comprised in E. Rose's¹⁰ article 'A Northern Hamlet' in *Fraser's Magazine* for 1877¹¹ and Gosse's review of F. C. Lascelles's translation (just named) in *The Academy* for 1875.¹² Disclaiming any wish to pit 'the greatest of Danish poets' against Shakespeare, Rose gives an account first of the relevant

¹ LXXXVI, 92.

² Ed. Saintsbury, G., 12 vols. (1897-1907).

³ p. 376.

⁴ p. 366.

⁵ Of course, the General Surveys described in § 3 above referred to the classics repeatedly as well as to their successors.

⁶ 'Igjennem Nat og Trængsel.'

⁷ Before 1867, the following were known in translation: *Aladdin*, *Axel og Valborg*, *Correggio*, *Hakon Jarl*, *Lykkeridderne*, *Nordens Guder*, *Palnatoke*.

⁸ In its review of Freeland's 'scholarly and skilful, but rather stiff' translation, *The Spectator* suggested that a version of *Stærkodder* might be

undertaken (XLVII, 274). Humphrey William Freeland was a friend of Hauch and may have written the two *North British Review* articles I mention (infra, pp. 267 and 275).

⁹ A biographical introduction by E. H. Palmer shows Butler to have been more interested in Mount Sinai than Denmark.

¹⁰ Edward Rose, the adapter of Benzon's *Skandale*, was mainly a writer and adapter of plays, but at this time he was interested in Shakespeareana and may therefore have been the author of this article.

¹¹ xv, 609.

¹² viii, 350.

passage in Ehlenschläger's source, Saxo's *Historia*, and then, supplemented by translated excerpts, of *Amleth*; he characterizes it as 'a bright and animated romantic play' and notes how Ehlenschläger 'has given the spirit of the time in which the plot is laid, as Shakespeare did not attempt to do'. Gosse praises the translation of *Hakon Jarl*, but regrets that Lascelles does not indicate the tragedy's place in its author's *œuvre* or in the history of Danish literature, an omission which he then proceeds adequately to make good.¹

Holberg received more valuable attention.² Oddly enough, three essays in translating a novelty, *Erasmus Montanus*, succeeded one another, though it remains doubtful if the last to appear, T. Weber's *Erasmus Montanus; or, Rasmus Berg* (1885), in quaint English and published at Copenhagen, reached any considerable British public. The same must be said for the same reason of the same translator's *Blue-Apron Statesman* (i.e. *Politiske Kandestøber*, 1885). An anonymous contributor to *The North British Review* in 1869³ reviewed under 'Danish literature—Ludvig Holberg' several of Holberg's works (of which he held *Niels Klim* the 'perfectest') and M. Hammerich's *Bidrag til en Skildring af Holberg*; and, after summarizing Holberg's life and character, his position in Danish literature and services to morals and language, gave a full account, together with copious extracts in English, of *Erasmus Montanus*. The essay is substantial and written with discriminating enthusiasm; it calls Holberg not only 'the father of modern Danish literature', but also 'a comic dramatist...second...alone to Plautus and Molière', while *Peder Paars* in some respects surpasses *Hudibras* and *Le Lutrin* for wit and humour. Two years later, *Fraser's Magazine*⁴ printed, after a short biographical introduction, another version of *Erasmus Montanus*, the work of P. Toft,⁵ to whom Holberg was 'one of the world's greatest satirists'. An unnamed, knowledgeable reviewer,⁶ who took a German edition of Georg Brandes's *Festskrift* for his text in *The Spectator* for 1886,⁷ joined issue with Gosse, who had recently called Holberg 'the greatest of Scandinavian writers', suggesting Ibsen as his supplanter. Lastly, another anonymous reviewer, in *The Saturday Review* for 1895,⁸ concentrated on those passages in V. Olsvig's *Det store Vendepunkt i Holbergs Liv* which deal with Holberg's indebtedness to English literature.

The works of Heiberg⁹ and Wessel remaining quite unknown, and those of Baggesen very nearly so, the only likely addition to the ranks of translated classics (until Hans Andersen could be admitted to their ranks) was Ewald. George Borrow's translation of *Balders Død—The Death of Balder from the Danish of Johannes Ewald (1773)*—appeared at long last¹⁰ in 1889, and the silence with which it was received justified the publishers who had refused to handle Borrow's numerous versions from the Scandinavian languages.¹¹

¹ Anonymous review (perhaps by Gosse too?), 'Ehlenschläger's "Earl Hakon"' in *Spectator*, XLVIII (1875), 115: '...in some respects the most interesting production in the modern literature of Scandinavia.'

² Geert Westfaler, *Niels Klim, Memoirs, History of Norway, Introduction to Universal History* were available in English before 1867. (Olsvig, V., *Holberg og England* (1913) deals with Holberg's stay in London and Oxford and the effect of his experiences there).

³ L., 440.

⁴ N.S. iv, 670.

⁵ Toft was evidently not the writer for *The North British Review*.

⁶ He may not impossibly have been William Archer.

⁷ 'Holberg: Poet, Satirist, Dramatist', LXIX, 200.

⁸ 'Holberg and Addison', LXXX, 413.

⁹ The almost complete neglect of Heiberg is notable.

¹⁰ It was made in 1829.

¹¹ Cf. Hustvedt, S. B., 'George Borrow and his Danish ballads', in *Journal of English and German Philology*, XXII (1923), 262; Wright, H., 'George Borrow's Translations from the Scandinavian languages', in *Edda*, XVI (1921), 137. Vols. VII, VIII and IX of the Norwich edition of Borrow's *Works* contain all his 'Songs of Scandinavia'.

The rich storehouse of ballad literature¹ to which Jamieson had first resorted had been made largely accessible by Prior and Buchanan in translation, and Svend Grundtvig's² labours received due notice in *The Athenaeum's* surveys. It did not, however, attract all the attention one might have expected. 'W.B.' reviewed Buchanan's *Ballad Stories of the Affections* in *The St James Magazine* for 1867³ and expressed gratification at the morality of the originals. Buchanan himself included a somewhat trifling chapter on 'The Old Ballads of Denmark' in *Master-Spirits* (1873).⁴ The anonymous review, 'Scandinavian Antiquities', of the researches of Worsaae, J. J. S. Steenstrup, De Chaillu and the like in *The Edinburgh Review* for 1891⁵ said a few words about Danish ballads (but about no other literature). In *Epic and Romance* (1897), however, W. P. Ker relied on the Danish 'Ungen Sveidal' and 'Sivard og Brynhild' for illustrating the difference between their ballad style and the epic style.⁶ Among the translations which William Morris printed in his *Poems by the Way* (1891) were 'Hildebrand and Hellelill', 'Agnes and the Hill-Man', 'Hafbor and Signy' and 'Knight Aagen and Maiden Else' (i.e. 'Hildebrand og Hellelill', 'Agnete og Havmanden', 'Havbor og Signelil' and 'Aagen og Else' respectively).

From traditional verse to traditional prose was a short step. J. Mulley began in *Folk-Lore Record* for 1881⁷ the translations of 'Danish Popular Tales' which he collected as *Fairy Tales from Afar, translated from the Danish... of S. Grundtvig* (1900); in 1899 J. C. B. Bay published *Danish Fairy and Folk Tales from... S. Grundtvig*. W. A. Craigie's *Scandinavian Folk-Lore* (1896) contains, together with material from Iceland, Norway and Sweden, translations of excerpts from the collections of S. Grundtvig, Kamp, Kristensen and Thiele, as well as from V. U. Hammershaimb's *Færøsk Anthologi*.

Professor Stephens's labours on the runic inscriptions attracted the attention of experts, for whom he wrote some articles in *The Antiquary* between 1881 and 1884.

A consideration of medieval Danish literature must embrace the *Historia Danica* of Saxo Grammaticus, particularly interesting to the *lettres* of Britain for the oldest mention of Hamlet and his revenge. In *The Nineteenth Century* for 1882⁸, Falbe, after a brief note on the author, translated 'with slight modifications' the relevant passages (which, as has been seen, E. Rose had summarized), and in 1894 Oliver Elton published *The first nine Books of the Danish History of Saxo Grammaticus* (1894). In 1872 appeared *Two Dissertations on the Hamlet of Saxo Grammaticus and Shakespeare* by R. G. Latham and in 1875 an article in *The Athenaeum*⁹, 'Saxo Grammaticus', by H. H. Howarth.

5. HANS CHRISTIAN ANDERSEN

Hans Andersen was 'the one foreign author whom we can never regard as an alien'.¹⁰ The number of the translations¹¹ and reprints of his *Eventyr* was almost legion. The British Museum catalogue shows no less than 42 collections between

¹ Vigfússon and York Powell's *Corpus poeticum boreale* (1883) was concerned with literature further back and further North.

² J. Mulley wrote a short introductory note on S. Grundtvig in his 'Danish popular tales', *ut infra*.

³ xviii, 285.

⁴ p. 225; another, 'A Morning in Copenhagen' (*ibid.* p. 211) has a few general references to Danish literature.

⁵ CLXXXIII, 332.

⁶ Edition of 1908, p. 126. Dr Sisson tells me that Ker's last words as professor in London were: 'Remember the Danish ballads.'

⁷ III, 201.

⁸ XII, 247 ('The Hamlet Saga').

⁹ I, 521.

¹⁰ Bain, R. N., *Hans Christian Andersen* (1895), v.

¹¹ Translations had begun in 1846.

1867 and 1900.¹ The more important newcomers would seem to be these mentioned in this and the paragraphs next following:

Hans Andersen's Fairy Tales, 'a new translation by Mrs Paull. With a special Adaptation and Arrangement for Young People (1867)'. The Preface declares it to be a complete collection, to date, of the tales suitable for young readers, arranged in such a way that the simplest come first.

The Wood-Nymph of Hans Christian Andersen, translated from the Danish by A. M. and Augusta Plesner² (1870).

Stories and Fairy Tales, by Hans Christian Andersen, translated by H. Oskar Sommer (2 vols. 1893).

The Little Mermaid and Other Stories, by Hans Christian Andersen, translated by R. Nisbet Bain (1893).

Fairy Tales, by Hans Christian Andersen, newly translated by H. L. Brækstad, illustrated by Hans Tegner (1900).

The Will-o'-the-Wisps are in Town and other new Tales of Hans Christian Andersen, translated by A. Plesner and S. Rugeley-Powers (1867), contained stories that had only been published in the sixties, viz. 'The Will-o'-the-Wisps are in Town' ('Lygtemændene ere i Byen'), 'Windmill' ('Vejrmøllen'), 'Silver Coin' ('Sølvskillingen'), 'Bishop of Børglum and his Kinsman' ('Bispen paa Børglum og hans Frænde'), 'In the Nursery' ('I Børnestuen'), 'Golden Treasure' ('Guldskat'), 'Storm moves the Sign-boards' ('Stormen flytter Skilt'); and *The Fairy Tales of Hans Christian Andersen*, translated by H. L. D. Ward and A. Plesner (1870), had the new 'Luck may be in a Stick' ('Lykken kan ligge i en Pinde'). Otherwise it seems,³ however, as if translators rested content with some of these and with other old favourites. In 1891 appeared *Hans Christian Andersen's Correspondence*, selected and translated by F. Crawford.⁴

In the way of commentary R. Nisbet Bain's biography, *Hans Christian Andersen* (1895), takes pride of place. It is, on the whole, a scholarly piece of work,⁵ with a preference of exposition to criticism; it takes its material from the published letters, memoirs and authorities then available, often quoting with approval the estimates given by Brandes in *Kritiker og Portraiter*. Bain by no means concentrates on the *Eventyr* alone, though he values them incalculably higher than the rest of his author's writing. The opinion of Andersen's character which he gives is balanced and somewhat frigid, and he attempts no general estimate, no comparison between Andersen and other Romantics or between his collection of fairy-tales and their rivals. The last point is taken up by Gosse in his Introduction⁶ to Brækstad's translation, where he draws a distinction between the fairy-tales on the one hand of Andersen (whom, at one point, he brings happily into connexion with Lewis Carroll) and on the other of the brothers Grimm and the 'modern folk-lorists'—a distinction which most of the illustrators to the English editions

¹ Bain's translation is preceded by an Introduction, with a passage about other translations, English and foreign, which is substantially reproduced as Appendix IV in his biography (vide infra). It concludes that Mrs Howitt's was still the best English version, as catching the spirit of the original most nearly; Ward and Plesner are good; Dulcken is complete, accurate, but unidiomatic. Siever is better than Sommer, who, however, is not bad; but there is nothing to be said for Peachey and Gardiner, Wehnert and Mrs Paull.

² Gosse had an introduction to Augusta Plesner, a Dane, when he went to Copenhagen,

and has a passage about her in *Two Visits to Denmark* (1911), p. 42.

³ There is no bibliography of Andersen of which I am aware. Certain tales were not published in English till the collected Oxford edition of 1914 and some, I think, have never been translated.

⁴ Anonymous notice, 'Correspondence of Hans Andersen', in *Saturday Review*, LXXII (1891), 643.

⁵ The many misprints should not be attributed to him.

⁶ All except the last paragraph was reprinted as 'Side Lights on Hans Andersen' in *The Critic*, XXXVII (New York, 1900), 360.

show to have been worth making. Gosse, who very properly pays a handsome tribute to Bain, adds a certain amount of personal reminiscence and concludes one of the best of the shorter studies on Andersen:

It will probably be centuries before Europe sees again a man in whom the same peculiarities of imagination are blended; she can never see one more blameless in his life, or inspired by an aim more delicate and guileless.

Allusions to his tales and notices of them and their author were very common; G. Browning published in 1875 an eight-page brochure *A Few Personal Recollections of Hans Christian Andersen*; the following seem to have been the more important articles in periodical publications:

- Anonymous: 'Story of my Life', in *Spectator*, XLIV (1871), 987. Review of a reprint of the translation of *Mit Livs Eventyr*.
- Anonymous:¹ 'Hans Christian Andersen', in *Spectator*, XLV (1872), 1173. An anodyne review of *Story of My Life*.
- Anonymous:² 'A few weeks with Hans Andersen', in *Temple Bar*, XLIII (1874-5), 387. Some familiar gossip, by a lady, with an account of a tale Andersen told her *extempore*.
- Anonymous:³ 'Two Danes', in *Temple Bar*, XLV (1875), 171. Something about Thorvaldsen, but mainly about the death of Andersen and his funeral, which the writer evidently attended.
- Anonymous:³ 'Hans Christian Andersen', in *Spectator*, XLVIII (1875), 1031. An obituary notice with a good deal of personal knowledge and reminiscence, besides biographical matter.
- B., W. G.: 'House of Fairy Tales', in *London Society*, XLI (1882), 44. A rather trumpery account of Andersen, in connexion with his birthplace at Odense.
- Gosse, Edmund: 'Hans Andersen's Jubilee', in *Academy*, VII (1875), 401. Some commentary on the 70th anniversary of Andersen's birth, with the information that he had been 'elected honorary member of the New British Scandinavian Society'.⁴
- Gosse, Edmund:⁵ 'Letters to and from Hans Christian Andersen', in *Temple Bar*, LIX (1880), 491. A conscientious and amusing short paper, with copious translations, based on *Breve til Hans Christian Andersen* (1877) and *Breve fra Hans Christian Andersen* (1878), with observations on the mass of material from which they were selected; has some remarks on Andersen's relations with Bjørnson and Georg Brandes.
- Wood, Annie: 'Andersen's Friendships', in *Temple Bar*, LI (1877), 493. Some gossip and letters.

With Andersen we come to an instance, recognized from the first, of influence exerted by Danish upon English literature, in the person of Oscar Wilde. Wilde not merely knew the *Eventyr* of Andersen, 'on' which pretty well every English-speaking child of the cultured classes was 'brought up', but valued the author highly, as appears in the draft of a letter to *The Pall Mall Gazette*:⁶

Hans Andersen wrote to please himself, to realise his own sense of beauty, and as he deliberately cultivated that simplicity of style and method which is a result of a subtle and self-conscious art, there are many children who take pleasure in his stories; but his true admirers, those who really appreciate how great an artist he was, are to be found not in the nursery, but on Parnassus.

Wilde recognized the artistry of Andersen's tales and the fact that their appeal to children was incidental only; that he likewise discerned the satire in them is

¹ Probably by Gosse.

² I think these two articles were by Annie Wood (vide infra, p. 274).

Probably not by Gosse.

⁴ I know nothing of this Society.

⁵ The author signs himself 'E.W.G.'

⁶ Cit. Herzog, ut infra, p. 42.

apparent in his own productions, in the two collections of short stories of the fairy-tale sort, *The Happy Prince and Other Stories* (1888) and *A House of Pomegranates* (1891). Ransome, in his monograph *Oscar Wilde* (1912), sums up¹ his general impression of these two volumes: 'Wilde wrote, with the pen of Flaubert, stories that might have been imagined by Andersen, and sometimes one and sometimes the other touches his hand.' It is not impossible that Baudelaire was also present.' Alice Herzog, in *Die Märchen Oscar Wildes* (1930), submitted the tales to closer scrutiny and, though her conclusions are substantially the same, she particularizes rather more: Andersen, she finds, touched Wilde's hand more insistently in the earlier collection, notably in 'The Devoted Friend', 'The Remarkable Rocket' and 'The Nightingale and the Rose', where a theme from Andersen's 'Historien om en Moder' combines with one from Persian literature; in *A House of Pomegranates*, Dr Herzog argues, the influence of Flaubert's *Trois Contes* prevails, though with Ransome² she points out resemblances to Andersen in details of 'The Birthday of the Infanta' and in the theme of 'The Star-Child'. The mermaid in 'The Fisherman and his Soul' seems an Andersenese *motif* also.

W. S. Gilbert adapted from Andersen's 'Kejserens nye Klæder' the *libretto* of *Eyes and No Eyes; or, The Art of Seeing*, produced, with music by F. Pascal, at St George's Hall, London, 5 July 1876; and Basil Hood dramatized 'Ib og lille Christine', *Ib and Little Christina*, produced³ at Prince of Wales Theatre, London, 15 May 1900.

Lord Brabourne's *Moonshine* (1882) and other fairy stories have none of the point and elegance of Wilde's, but it seems to me possible that his personifications of natural objects and his very gently satirical humour may likewise owe something specific to Hans Andersen.

6. RECENT DANISH NOVELISTS⁴

Besides the fiction of Hans Christian Andersen, there were the following translations of Danish novels between 1867 and 1900:

- J. V. Bergsøe: *Bruden fra Rørvig: The Bride of Roervig* (translated by Nina Francis, 1877).
 H. F. Ewald: *Valdemar Krone's Ungdoms Historie: Story of Waldemar Krone's Youth* (anon. Edinburgh, 1867).
John Falk: John Falk (by the translator of *Nøddebo Parsonage*, 1868).
 J. P. Jacobsen: *Niels Lyhne: Siren Voices* (Ethel F. L. Robertson, 1896).
 H. Pontoppidan: *Mimoser: The Apothecary's Daughters* (C. Nielsen, 1890).
Muld: Emanuel; or, Children of the Soil (Mrs E. Lucas, 1892).
Forfættede Land: Promised Land (Mrs E. Lucas, 1896).
 C. H. Scharling: *Ved Nytaarstid i Nøddebo Præstegaard: Nøddebo Parsonage* (by the translator of 'The Guardian',⁵ 1867).
Uffe Hjelm's og Palle Loves Bedrifter: Rivals (by the translator of *Nøddebo Parsonage*, 1869).⁶
Min Hustru og Jeg: Nicolai's Marriage (by the translator of 'The Guardian', 1876).⁷

¹ p. 90.

² p. 89.

³ I have no doubt there were other English dramatizations, though Andersen never conquered the English Christmas pantomime.

⁴ I have had to ignore a considerable number of odd notes, testifying to a general curiosity about Danish fiction, e.g. a few anonymous lines in *Academy*, XI (1877), 51, praising *Mester Oles Prædiken* by Erik Bøgh for its briskness and wit.

⁵ I have been unable to identify either this book or the translator.

⁶ Scharling wrote a short introduction, specially for English readers, explaining whom the proper names (from Saxo) referred to.

⁷ Goldschmidt was known before 1867 and possibly an American publication, *The Flying Mail* (Boston, 1870), found some British readers.

The poet Paludan-Müller's prose tale *Ungdomskilden* was rendered into English as *The Fountain of Youth* by H. W. Freeland (1867). The Pseudonym Library included *Danish Stories*, *The Cruise of The 'Wild Duck' and Other Tales*, by Drachmann (1893). The translator subscribed himself H.C.M. and added a brief introduction, of which the gist is that 'Holger Drachmann's literary activity has been unusually wide in its range...; the high place he holds among men of letters in his own country was gained, in the first place, by his poetry rather than by his prose...he loves the sea as perhaps only Englishmen and Scandinavians love her'; the 'Cruise of the "Wild Duck"' is 'Kutteren "Vildanden"', taken from *Vildt og Tæmnet* (1881), the other five tales come from *Smaa Fortællinger* (1884), viz. 'Hundede og blev begravet', 'Skib i Kirke', 'En Roman i Klitten', 'Omkring Kap Horn' and 'Hvorledes og hvorfor Lodsoldermanden fik sig en Spilledaase'.¹

The list just given shows that the two best-known Danish novelists were Scharling and Pontoppidan. The former, though his personal contacts with England may have had something to do with establishing the favour he enjoyed, probably appealed by reason of the ingenuous *gaucherie* often attributed to 'small nations'. He certainly had a good press. In a review given up to *Nøddebo Parsonage*, *The Spectator* in 1867 declared it had 'not seen a truer work of art for many years than Henrik Scharling's story of country life in Denmark';² what two years later it says³ about *The Rivals* is only a little less enthusiastic; and in 1876 S. Statham in *The Academy* thought⁴ very well also of *Nicolai's Marriage*. *Fraser's Magazine*, which reviewed *Nøddebo Parsonage* together with Fernan Cabellero's *Gaviota*,⁵ attributed genius to Scharling, whom it likened to the author of *The Vicar of Wakefield*. *The Athenaeum*, on the other hand, in 1869 reviewed⁶ *The Rivals* unfavourably, and its general reviews scarcely mention Scharling (who renounced *belles-lettres* comparatively soon). Critical attention paid to Pontoppidan amounted to much less. *The Athenaeum* chronicled most of his productions, and Bain, with justice, called him in 1897⁷ 'indisputably Denmark's most virile, most truculent penman'. J. B. Allen briefly noticed *The Apothecary's Daughters* among 'New Novels' in *Academy* for 1890,⁸ and quite missed the point of it, as someone ignorant of the 'Sedelighedsfejde' well might do; but otherwise the three English translations seem to have passed virtually unnoticed.

The following are the more important articles on Danish novelists, additional to those already mentioned:

- On H. F. Ewald: Edmund Gosse, 'Ewald's Scottish Woman at Tjele', in *Academy*, iv (1873), 82. An account of *Skotske Kvinde paa Tjele*,⁹ by 'the most individual and characteristic romancist that Denmark has produced'.
- On Goldschmidt: Edmund Gosse, 'Meir Aaron Goldschmidt', in *Athenaeum*, II (1887), 278. Speaking from good personal acquaintanceship, Gosse praises especially Goldschmidt's graceful style and his Jewish stories; the adequate biographical account lays stress on the activities of *Corsaren*.
- On Thomas Lange: Anonymous short obituary notice in *Athenaeum* II (1887), 314.
- On Erik Skram:¹⁰ Edmund Gosse, review of *Gertrude Coldbjørnson*,¹¹ in *Academy*,

¹ The Misses Zimmer's *Half-Hours with Foreign Novelists* (1880) ignores Denmark.

² XL, 47: one might observe that in England alone the last few years had seen the publication of *The Mill on the Floss*, *The Cloister and the Hearth*, *Atalanta in Calydon* and *Enoch Arden*.

³ 'Henrik Scharling's New Novel', XLII, 450.

⁴ 'New Novels', ix, 480.

⁵ 'A Spanish and a Danish Novel', LXXVI, 190, I, 432.

⁷ *Cosmopolis*, VIII, 73. ⁸ XXXVII, 96.

⁹ Not translated into English.

¹⁰ First mentioned in the *Athenaeum* surveys in 1879; *Herregaardsbilleder* (pseudonymously published) had a little praise in 1877.

¹¹ *Gertrude Coldbjørnson* was not translated.

On Topsøe:¹

XVII (1880), 300. Though *Fru Marie Grubbe* is mentioned, Skram's book is welcomed as a new departure in Danish fiction, mainly for its style and the analysis of the heroine's emotions. Edmund Gosse, 'Vilhelm Topsøe—Elizabeth Baumann-Jerichau', in *Academy*, xx (1881), 70. A joint obituary notice gives a brief account of Topsøe's career, pits his 'European interests' against party-antagonism at home and mentions his friendship with Cherbuliez.

Jacobsen made a disappointingly weak appeal. Gosse, who had heard about him from Georg Brandes at the outset, never wrote on him at any length until he provided the flowery, but somewhat insubstantial Introduction² to the translation of *Niels Lyhne* in 1896, which, admirable though it might be in the assessment of his style, 'placed' Jacobsen, for the benefit of English readers, in the history neither of Danish fiction nor of European literature. Nor was, apparently, the translation itself much appreciated: *The Academy* gave it a superficial and unfavourable short notice, the only one I have been able to find,³ though it concedes that 'this famous novel... is rich in passages of exquisite beauty and suggestive thought'. The translator, Ethel F. L. Robertson, contributed an article on Jacobsen, 'A Danish Poet', to *Cosmopolis* in 1897.⁴ Comparing him, as Gosse had done, with Pater, she insists that his 'talent was essentially a lyric one', but does not cite his formal verse to support the proposition, and, on the whole, though enthusiastic, she is rather maladroit, as when she says of this novel about the 1850's that it 'embodies in a peculiar degree the hopes and struggles, the dreams and disillusion of our century's end'. The British *fin de siècle* was not captivated.

A somewhat confused article by Hermione Ramsden in *Nineteenth Century* for 1900,⁵ 'The New Mysticism in Scandinavia' (which makes Jacobsen responsible for this phenomenon), devotes some pages to the prose of Jørgensen, concluding that he 'will never be a great novelist, because he has only one character, and that his own'.

Herman Bang is mentioned (but scarcely more) in the *Athenaeum* surveys from 1880 on; so are (in 1884 and 1885) the writings and tragic fate of Ada Ravnkilde, whose *To Fortællinger* are 'stamped with deep earnestness and true personal passion'.

If *Jason med den gyldne Skind*, *Fru Marie Grubbe*, *Niels Lyhne*, *Forskreuet* and *Møllen* be reckoned as the outstanding achievements in Danish fiction during these 34 years and, taken all round, Schandorph⁶ the best novelist after Jacobsen (as well they may), we must acknowledge that they evoked but a feeble echo. The least unsuccessful was *Niels Lyhne*, of which perhaps it may be said that it would strike a contemporary English reader, even though he were familiar with Turgeniev, as the most exotic.

¹ *Jason med den gyldne Skind* was mentioned in the *Athenaeum* survey for 1875 as giving 'evidence of a thoroughly cultivated mind, and an acute and subtle psychological insight', and there are references to *Natidsbilleder* in 1878 and to *Fra Studiebogen* in 1879, without the author being named on any of these three occasions.

² 'A foreigner may... form some conception... when one explains that into a literature remarkable for lucidity and a wild-wood sweetness in its prose, this young man seemed to come trailing a long garland of jasmine and stephanotis,

and bringing with it a sort of dusky tropical mystery... he is with André Chénier, with Keats, with Rossetti' (vi).

³ L (1896), 113.

⁴ VIII, 346.

⁵ XLVII, 279.

⁶ It seems strange that Schandorph did not receive more recognition in Britain after the proper and discriminating praise of Brandes, Boyesen and *The Athenaeum's* notices; he would probably have proved the most congenial novelist of his generation.

7. DANISH POETRY

In the nature of the case, not much Danish lyric was translated, especially if ballads, dealt with in an earlier section, are set aside. As far as bulk goes, most of what now¹ became accessible in English was contained in *The Hymns of Denmark*,² translated by Gilbert Tait (London, 1868); with versions from Arrebo, Birkedal, Boye, Brorson, Christensen, Johannes Ewald, Frimann, Grundtvig, Hammerich, Heilmann, Hjort, Hygom, Ingemann, Kampmann, Kingo, Liebenberg, Lund, Malling, Naur, Æhlenschläger, Oldenberg, Pawels, Plum, Pram-Gad, Ramus, Rasmussen, Rothe, Smith, Sporon, Sthen, Storm, Thaarup, Thomissoen, Timm, Wexels, Zetlitz,³ as well as from some unnamed authors. The chapter 'Danish Romances' in Robert Buchanan's *Master-Spirits* (1873) contained versions of Winther's 'Danske Romancer'. Gosse printed his own translations (and the originals) of two pieces each from Arrebo's *Hexaëmeron* and Bødtcher's *Mødet med Bacchus* in *Studies in the Literature of Northern Europe*; and the article, almost certainly by him, in *The Spectator* for 1879⁴ on 'Ambrosius Stub' gave, with a short biography of 'the first great lyricist of Denmark', a verse translation of 'Skal Dahlens Lillie' ('And shall the Lily of the Vale'). Butler's *Axel and Valborg*⁵ was accompanied by two versions from the Norwegian Munch and by

To * * *

When down the stream the swan is softly gliding
Then think I, O my silent friend! on thee....

From the Danish of Professor Hauch.

The article in *Temple Bar*, 'Two Danes',⁶ comprised a translation from Ploug, 'Sleep, weary child', as well as one from Hans Andersen, 'The Poet's Last Song', both signed 'A.W.'⁷ Lastly, there was a sumptuous illustrated volume, *The Pilgrimage of Truth* (1895), translated by Agnes B. Warburg from *Sandhedens Pilgrimsgang* of Erik Bøgh.

Critical appreciation of Danish poetry, on the other hand, proved, by comparison, judicious and quite plentiful. The chapter, 'Four Danish Poets' in Gosse's *Studies in the Literature of Northern Europe* dealt with Grundtvig, Bødtcher, Hans Christian Andersen and Paludan-Müller, all of whom the author had seen and heard in Denmark and with three of whom he had conversed (Grundtvig forming the exception).⁸ Biography, personal reminiscence and high artistic appreciation are accordingly blended in the accounts he gives; in the case of Andersen, however, nothing and in the case of Grundtvig (whom he likens to Carlyle) very little is said about the verse; the latter will 'always rank high among the poets of the North, although he lacked the gifts of concentration and compression'; nor does (at this time) Gosse attempt any comprehensive criticism of Danish poetry.⁹

Each of the following articles was substantially written on one Danish poet:

On Bødtcher: Edmund Gosse, 'Ludvig Bødtcher', in *Academy*, vi (1874), 432.
An obituary notice, with some personal recollection; every one

¹ *Love Poems of all Nations* (ed. Kained, J., 1870), with contributions derived from Æhlenschläger, Winther and the ballad literature, seems only to have reprinted extant matter. Waddington, S., *Sonnets of Europe* (1888), ignores Denmark.

² The collection has a short Preface by the translator, of very slight literary interest. It was reviewed in *Athenaeum*, i (1868), 431.

³ It may be that some of the authors whom I have been unable to identify were Norwegians.

⁴ *LI*, 820; see also the next section, *infra*, p. 277.

⁵ *Vide supra*, p. 266.

⁶ *Vide supra*, p. 270.

⁷ Almost certainly Annie Wood. I have not identified the originals of these two translations, nor that of the translation from Hauch.

⁸ Cf. *Two Visits to Denmark* (1911), pp. 79, 342, 98 (and 237) and 120 respectively.

⁹ Something approaching it is found in the 11th edition of *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, viii (1910), s.v. Denmark: Literature.

- of Bødtker's scanty poems is a 'gem, cut and engraved with the most exquisite precision'.¹
- On Grundtvig: Anonymous, a brief obituary of 'Bishop Nicolas Grundtvig', in *Athenaeum*, II (1872), 368.
- On Hauch: Anonymous,² 'Carsten Hauch and his latest poem', in *North British Review*, XLVII (1867), 94. The article is ostensibly on *Julian den Frafaldne*, but, with copious translations, gives a full and valuable survey of Hauch's output and indicates his place in Northern literature.
- On Holst: R. N. Bain, 'Hans Peter Holst', in *Athenaeum*, I (1893), 734. A summary of the life and work of the recently deceased, who was 'not, perhaps, a great poet like Christian Winther, for instance; but his style, both in prose and verse, has rare and singular distinction, and he was certainly the Danish writer of occasional verse *par excellence*'.
- On Paludan-Müller: Edmund Gosse, review of *Tidene Skifte* and *Adonis*, in *Academy*, VI (1874), 552. The latter 'is a masterpiece of melody and dignity', while the play also gets its measure of praise. Edmund Gosse, 'Frederik Paludan-Müller', in *Academy*, XI (1877), 9. The dead poet and especially his *Adam Homo* are great; the writer gives an account of his personal contacts with Paludan-Müller. Edmund Gosse, 'Frederik Paludan-Müller', in *Athenaeum*, I (1877), 18. A short appraisal, by way of obituary, of 'one of the greatest and most original poets of our time', whose *Adonis* again receives the highest encomium.
- On Ploug: Anonymous, a brief obituary 'Carl Ploug', in *Athenaeum*, II (1894), 606.
- On Richardt:³ Edmund Gosse, 'Christian Richardt', in *Athenaeum*, I (1892), 19. A short, very laudatory obituary of 'the uncrowned laureate of Denmark', who 'seemed to start lyrical poetry anew, using with extreme boldness the most modern vocabulary but giving it distinction... He was not an intellectual force; he had nothing to give but music'.
- On Winther: Edmund Gosse, 'Christian Winther', in *Academy*, XI (1877), 30. 'There never was a lyricist more fresh, more spontaneous; none more steeped in the dew and light and perfume of a cool, sunshiny morning in May...'. Edmund Gosse, 'Christian Winther', in *Athenaeum* (1877), 49. 'Winther stands unapproached in Danish literature, as a purely lyrical poet. In the delicacy of his sentiment, the realism of his nature studies, he stands beside Wordsworth and Sully Prudhomme.'

The older poets surviving into our period thus received very adequate notice in Britain; they who succeeded were less fortunate, and Drachmann, though Gosse knew him personally and though he was repeatedly mentioned in *The Athenaeum* surveys, really fared worst; Bain tells the *Cosmopolis* public little more than that he was (in 1896) among 'the veterans' and (in 1898) 'one of the most charming of authors'. (However, at the end of the century, in 1900,⁴ Drachmann was in London, where he was entertained to dinner or lunch by Gosse, who made amends for his neglect by a fairly satisfactory article on him in *The Encyclopaedia Britannica*.⁵)

¹ This and others in the list were more or less embodied in 'Four Danish Poets'.

² The author may have been H. W. Freeland.

³ Gosse's general article in *Academy*, VIII

(1878), 378, embraced a short criticism of Richardt's *Billeder og Sange*.

⁴ Charteris, E., *Sir Edmund Gosse*, pp. 271, 245.

⁵ Tenth edition, vol. XVII (1902), s.v.

8. RECENT DANISH DRAMA

When Gosse wrote on 'The Danish National Theatre', in *The Cornhill Magazine* for 1874,¹ the dramatic authors whom he singled out were the classics, Holberg, Johannes Ewald, Wessel, Øhlenschläger and Heiberg, and one playwright quite newly dead, Henrik Hertz.² Archer's article in Harper's *New Monthly Magazine* for 1892³ covered only little more literary ground, but treated at greater length than Gosse had done the successive Royal Theatres of the capital, their organization and personnel.

Two years earlier, however, Archer had, for *The Fortnightly Review*⁴ written the kind of survey which is so regrettably lacking for the other genres, 'Danish Drama of Today'. Like Gosse, Archer insists that, even if the 'Danish dramatists have learnt much both from their Norwegian and their French contemporaries', their work is eminently 'original' and 'natural', and he is able to add 'actual', even to the degree of imputing photographic methods to them. He begins his survey proper with Bloch's *Lygteænd.*⁵ He speaks well of Einar Christiansen and of Karl Larsen, mentions Topsøe's posthumous *Umyndige i Kjærlighed* and the contributions to drama of Drachmann, Schandorph, Bang, Esmann, Steenbuch, P. A. Rosenberg, Erik (and Amalie) Skram.⁶ His chief praise, however, goes to Edvard Brandes,⁷ both as playwright and critic, and to Benzon,⁸ whose *Skandale* is, to him, a 'masterpiece', 'neater and stronger' than Augier's *Les Fourchambault*.

It is a sign of Archer's influence that works by his favourites should shortly be seen on the British stage, oddly enough within a few days of one another. The 'Independent Theatre' organization presented Edvard Brandes's *En Besøg*, translated by Archer himself as *A Visit*, at the Royalty Theatre, London, on 4 March 1892.⁹ Otto Benzon's *Skandale*, adapted, apparently with the author's help, by E. Rose (having the title changed to *The Plowdens* and the place of action, quite incomprehensibly,¹⁰ moved to Nottingham), was given at the Prince of Wales Theatre, London on 8 March 1892. J. H. McCarthy criticized both these productions in his 'Pages on Plays' in *Gentleman's Magazine*¹¹ and was noticeably favourable to the latter, 'a very interesting piece of work, very dexterously fitted to the conditions of English life, and containing some very caustic studies of middle-class meanness and of middle-class baseness'. About *A Visit* he had less to say, and the unnamed critic of *The Theatre*¹² was equally non-committal, though he too considered *The Plowdens* 'a brilliantly written comedy', which the authors were proposing to improve by condensing its four acts into three. These plays were neither followed up nor printed. There was, however, another, only fragmentary translation of *Skandale*, entitled *A Regular Scandal* (1886), published at Copenhagen, the work of R. Wintle, a local teacher of English.

¹ xxx, 297. The article was reprinted in *Studies in the Literature of Northern Europe* (1879) and was translated in full in *Fædrelandet* (Kjøbenhavn, 13 November 1874).

² Whose *Kong René's Datter* had been repeatedly Englished before 1867, without, apparently, occasioning any further exploration of his output or personality.

³ European edition, xxiii, 443.

⁴ N.S. XLVII (1890), 682.

⁵ Of Hostrup he only mentions the last plays.

⁶ Besides these, the *Athenaeum* surveys mention Emma Gad (first in 1890), F. Steincke (do.), Kaalund (in 1882), Ernst von der Recke (first in 1873).

⁷ First mentioned in *Athenaeum* survey for 1882. In speaking of *Lykkens Blendverk*, Bain exclaimed: 'Surely this is a libel on the domestic life of Copenhagen!' (*Cosmopolis*, xi (1898), 682).

⁸ First mentioned in *Athenaeum* survey for 1884.

⁹ It must have been a public performance, since the licenser of plays had ordered the deletion of certain passages which were circulated in print among the audience (*Times*, 5 March 1892, p. 12). In the bill were Arthur Symonds's *Minister's Call* and a translation of Banville's *Baiser*.

¹⁰ Kensington would have been the equivalent; but see McCarthy's criticism in this paragraph.

¹¹ CCLXXII (1892), 421.

¹² N.S. XIX (1892), 207.

Molbech's *Ambrosius* is mentioned by Archer in connexion with 'a slight romantic revival' and styled 'pleasant' by Viggo Petersen in *Athenaeum*.¹ It underwent translation into English by Alice Berry² (*Ambrosius*, Edinburgh 1879), and à propos of it *The Spectator* printed an anonymous 'Ambrosius Stub' in that year,³ which hinged equally on Barfod's collected *Digte af Ambrosius Stub*. When Molbech died, *The Athenaeum* had a brief obituary.⁴

9. MISCELLANEOUS WRITERS: GEORG BRANDES

Though some of them were known to experts, the writings of Martensen, Høffding, Steenstrup, Vimmer and Julius Lange must be considered too special for inclusion in this paper, and the only miscellaneous writer seriously to come into account is the leader of his generation, Georg Brandes. It should be noted, however, that Eleonora Christina Ulfeldt's recently discovered *Jammers-Minde* was translated into English by F. E. Bunnett as *Memoirs of Leonora Christina* (1872), and that Gosse's 'Pictures of Danish Life' in *Academy* (1873)⁵ dealt appreciatively with Carl Andersen's *Genrebilleder*.

In spite of the qualms of his orthodox host, Gosse struck up a warm friendship with Brandes during his second stay in Copenhagen, dedicated his *Studies in the Literature of Northern Europe* to 'Dr Georg Brandes of Berlin, the most distinguished of Scandinavian critics', and lost few other opportunities of extolling his name; and one of Brandes's closer disciples, Adolf Hansen, had, as has been observed, written the annual summaries in *The Athenaeum* just when Brandes was making a name for himself—a phenomenon not allowed to pass unnoticed there. Nevertheless, the progress of his fame was rather slow, and for a long time he was as often as not hailed as a 'German savant'.⁶

The following translations from Brandes appeared on the London book-market before 1901:

'German Literature': article in *Academy*, xiv (1878), 294.

'New Danish and Norwegian Poetry': article in *Academy*, xvi (1879), 266.⁷

Lord Beaconsfield: Mrs George Sturges's translation of *Benjamin Disraeli* (from the revised, German version, 1880).

Impressions from Russia: S. C. Eastman's translation of *Indtryk fra Rusland* (1890).⁸

'Othello': a French translation of a chapter from *William Shakespeare*, in *Cosmopolis*, i (1896), 154.

'Henrik Ibsen en France': a French translation of 'Henrik Ibsen i Frankrig', in *Cosmopolis*, v (1897), 112.

William Shakespeare: W. Archer, Mary Morison and Diana White's translation of *William Shakespeare* (1898).

Henrik Ibsen, Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson: Jessie Muir's translation of three essays on 'Henrik

¹ Ut cit. 451 and ii, 831 respectively.

² Who made a few quite minor changes.

³ LII, 820, probably by Gosse, who knew both Molbech and the poetry of Stub and had met Barfod.

⁴ 1888, i, 698.

⁵ iv, 182. *Three Sketches of Life in Iceland*, translated from Carl Andersen, appeared in 1879.

⁶ That was partly because Gosse, not improperly, called him 'of Berlin' at the time of his Dedication, partly because he wrote on German literature for *The Academy*, partly because the earliest translation of a book by him was made by Mrs Sturges from the German version of *Benjamin Disraeli*. One reason for the tardiness of his reputation was, perhaps, the fact that he

did not write much on English literature and that his volume on *Naturalism in England* remained untranslated till the twentieth century. J. Nichol, however, in his monograph on Byron ('English Men of Letters' series, 1880, p. 140), refers to 'Professor Brandes of Copenhagen' and 'his striking sketch' of Byron.

⁷ Vide supra, p. 265.

⁸ This is a reprint of the New York edition of 1889; some British readers no doubt knew *Eminent Authors of the Nineteenth Century*, R. B. Anderson's translation of several essays, which was published at New York, probably in 1886; it contained, *inter alia*, papers on H. C. Andersen and F. Paludan-Müller and some of the contents of *Henrik Ibsen, Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson*.

Ibsen' and Mary Morison's translation of the chapter on 'Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson', in *Den moderne Gjennembruds Mænd* (1899).

'Denmark and Germany': article, translated from 'Danmark og Tyskland', in *Contemporary Review*, LXXVI (1899), 92.

The books in the above list all received notices. *The Spectator's* 'German View of Lord Beaconsfield' in 1880¹ was mainly unfavourable, both on political and literary grounds,² complaining with some justice of a 'strange over-estimate of Mr Disraeli's novels'. The book on Russia in 1890 met with a mixed reception: in *The Academy*³ W. R. Morfill, a rival, found it superficial and inaccurate; 'Our Library Table' (anonymous) in *The Athenaeum*⁴ gave a warm welcome to the literary sections, while dismissing the rest; and *The Spectator*⁵ in 'A Continental View of Russia', looking at it from several angles, said that 'it surpasses every contribution we are acquainted with'. In the nature of the case, *William Shakespeare* attracted the most attention, almost wholly favourable and often enthusiastic: after a manner of speaking, Brandes held the blue ribbon of general Shakespeare criticism⁶ between Dowden and Bradley.⁷ Bain wrote in *Cosmopolis*⁸: 'Brandes's wonderful monograph on Shakespeare is in every way worthy of this profound and exquisite scholar, who is indisputably the first critic in Europe... it is by far the ablest book that has ever been written on... the life of Shakespeare', and praise of this kind was found in most reviews, though the more serious periodicals rather strangely passed the book over. The studies of Ibsen and Bjørnson met with a poor reception. *The Spectator* spared only a very skimpy note in 'Some Books of the Week',⁹ and the only other reaction I have discerned is in two consecutive contributions to *The Academy*.¹⁰ The first of these, anonymous, 'Ibsen the Man', retorted somewhat sharply on the eulogies on Brandes with which William Archer prefaced the translation ('I can remember no other instance in which a great critic, having followed the work of a great poet from, practically, the outset of the poet's career, has republished as they stood his successive impressions...', 'here, and here only, has a critical intelligence of the first order been brought to bear in detail upon the poet's [i.e. Ibsen's] creations'¹¹); while C. E. Raimund, in the second article, 'Ibsen the Force', declared that 'Dr Brandes's Ibsen is as like the Ibsen of the plays as Yorick's skull was like the living face of Yorick'.

The *Athenaeum* surveys dealt, of course, repeatedly with the writings of Brandes that were not available in English, and he was fortunate in being properly valued at the outset by Sigurdson, Jessen and Hansen, for Viggo Petersen and Ipsen had their reasons for coolness. In *Cosmopolis* Bain mentioned,¹² with high praise, the reprint of the chapters on Heine from *Det unge Tyskland*, for him Brandes's study was 'the best critical estimate of Andersen's tales existing or conceivable',¹³ and there were also the following relevant articles:¹⁴

Anonymous: Note in *Academy*, iv (1873), 442, on Brandes's 'Brilliant examination of Hauch's dramas and lyrics' in *Nyt Dansk Maanedsskrift*.

¹ LIII, 303.

² *The Spectator* evidently thought there was nothing to choose between the sophistries of the statesman and of his defender.

³ XXXVII, 438.

⁴ I, 338.

⁵ LXIV, 696.

⁶ There were issues of the English translation in 1899, 1901, 1905, 1907; and gobbets were issued as Prefaces to an edition of Shakespeare (one play *per* volume) by the publisher William Heinemann. Lee's *Life of Shakespeare* appeared in the same year; as it aimed to be pure biography,

contrasts with Brandes's critical study were freely drawn.

⁷ '...he is certainly among the critics of Shakespeare who have plucked the golden bough' (Ralli, A., *History of Shakespearean Criticism*, II (1932), 154).

⁸ LXXXIII (1899), 25.

⁹ VIII (1897), 79.

¹⁰ LVII (1899), 78.

¹¹ Ed. cit. pp. ix and xiii.

¹² XI (1898), 683.

¹³ *Hans Christian Andersen*, ut cit. p. ix.

¹⁴ Besides Boyesen's chapter mentioned above, p. 265.

- Anonymous: Note in *Academy*, vi (1874), 404, on establishment of *Det nittende Aarhundrede*, with especial appreciation of Georg Brandes.
- Anonymous:¹ 'A foreign critic on English poetry', in *Spectator*, XLIX (1878), 145. A review of *Hovedstrømninger i det 19de Aarhundredes Literatur*, IV: *Byron og hans Gruppe*, declaring that Brandes's 'knowledge and accuracy are surprising', giving a just and lively indication of the salient points and dwelling on the fair treatment meted out to Scott and Wordsworth.
- Anonymous: 'Holberg: Poet, Satirist, Dramatist', in *Spectator*, LXIX (1886), 200. A laudatory review of Brandes's *Festskrift*.²
- Norregard, J.: 'Georg Brandes, a silhouette', in *Yellow Book*, VIII (1896), 163. A somewhat jejune short biography and appreciation, by a Dane, of 'the finest of living critics'.³

Brandes's influence on English literature was probably not significant. Gosse, Archer and others had effectively anticipated the efforts which he made not only on behalf of Ibsen and Bjørnson, but also of Danish authors. The stimulating *Hovedstrømninger*, if they had any effect, had it in the twentieth century. The author's skilful blending of biographical data, impressions and criticisms in his shorter, *causerie*-like articles could more easily be learned from his own master Sainte-Beuve. His book on Russia probably helped to widen the horizon of such English readers as wished to see beyond Turgeniev and Tolstoy, but it came between the two 'seminal' impacts of Russian literature on this country. The attempt, certainly now carried further than before, to elucidate Shakespeare's character and mentality from his writings was probably not so novel in the ambience that had welcomed Dowden as on the Continent;⁴ but, though Frank Harris persistently relegated Brandes among 'the professors', it seems not unlikely that the germ of his book *The Man Shakespeare* (1909), with the very direct connexion it assumes between supposed experience and artistic expression and with the intent to plot a continuous life-pattern from both, was fostered, if not instilled, by earlier reading of *William Shakespeare*.⁵

BRIAN W. DOWNS

CAMBRIDGE

APPENDIX: THE FÆROES

Some of the British tourists who stayed for a shorter or longer time at Thorshavn put their impression of the Færoes on record. What they found to say about literature was very scanty. Thus Charles Edwardes's 'The Faroe Islands', in *The Gentleman's Magazine* for 1888,⁶ speaks quite briefly of the written ballads available and (without naming him) of Hammershaimb's literary labours. In the Introduction to his translation of *The Tale of Thrond of Gate commonly called Færeyinga Saga* (1896) F. York Powell translated⁷ some of the Færoese ballad analogues to pieces of the Icelandic saga and gave a concise survey of the printed sources which the student of Færoese literature should consult.⁸

B. W. D.

¹ Very likely by Gosse.

² Vide supra, p. 267.

³ There are two paragraphs in *The Academy* for 1877 (383 and 449) relative to the 'Persecution of Dr Brandes' and his departure to Berlin.

⁴ Nevertheless, Leslie Stephen used Brandes's biography, together with Lee's, as a starting-point for the theoretical discussion of the validity of his method ('Shakespeare the Man' in *National Review*, XXXVII (1901), 220, then in *Studies of a Biographer*, iv (1902), 1).

⁵ It is to be remarked that there is next to no comment on Kierkegaard during our period; what there is occurs, for the most part, incidentally in discussions of Ibsen, e.g. Stobart, M. A., in *Fortnightly Review*, N.S. LXVI (1899), 227. Cf. also p. 266 above.

⁶ CCLXIV, 149.

⁷ p. xviii.

⁸ For Craigie's use of Hammershaimb vide supra, p. 268.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

Owing to war conditions the following emendations of Professor A. H. Krappe's 'The Fisher King' (vol. xxxix, January 1944, pp. 18-23) arrived too late to be inserted:

p. 18, last line, after 'secondary' add: At Tegea the chthonian Ares was called 'Ἀφνευός,¹ 'the Rich'. The Babylonian Queen of the Dead, Ereškigal Allatu, is the owner of enormous treasures,² and it was a view widely held in ancient Mesopotamia that the lower world is the home of wealth and riches.³

p. 19, note 6, add: Varro, *De re rustica*, I, 57.

p. 22, note 1, delete: 1896.—Note 5 delete: 61.

EDITOR

NORTHERN ENGLISH 'MARDY'

Mr Ivor Brown, author of *A Word in your Ear* and *Just Another Word*, comments upon the northern English 'mardy' ('cry-baby', and by extension 'spoilt child'), and confesses his ignorance as to its origin. Various theories have been suggested, the most generally accepted being S. O. Addy's 'marred'.⁴ This etymology, however, ignores one of the most frequent of its uses. I would suggest that the word is an adjective derived from a noun 'mard', itself a vestige of the French *merde*, 'human excrement': the shift from *er* to *ar* is too common to require commentary. Colour is lent to this suggestion, first by the fact that both Derbyshire and Lincolnshire possess the noun *mardo*, used of excrements when talking to very small children, and secondly by a common Yorkshire usage. In Yorkshire one hears *mardy arse* and *mardy bum* quite as often as *mardy* alone. In these expressions the voice accentuates the adjective rather than the noun. Hence my suggestion of Fr. *merde* satisfies phonology and usage. Semantics may offer a little difficulty, but consideration of ordinary psychology solves the problem. When a child is weeping it is normal for him to be told, either that he is a big boy and 'big boys don't cry', or else that he is behaving like a baby and not like a boy of his age. In this case, the term *mardy bum* would imply that he is nearer the napkin stage than adolescence: it is thus equivalent to 'cry-baby'.

KENNETH URWIN

CARDIFF

CHAPMAN'S USE OF CARTARI IN THE FIFTH SESTIAD OF 'HERO AND LEANDER'

In the Fifth Sestiad of *Hero and Leander*, the nymph Teras tells the story of how the young Hymen won his bride Eucharis. Professor Bush thinks that Chapman probably read this story in Servius's commentary on the *Aeneid* (IV, 99; I, 651), but notes that it is also told by Boccaccio in the *De Genealogia Deorum*, and by Vincenzo Cartari in his immensely popular treatise *Le Imagini de i Dei de gli*

¹ Paus. VIII, 44, 6.

² A. Jeremias, *Handbuch der altorientalischen Geisteskultur*, Berlin-Leipzig, 1929, p. 162.

³ A. Jeremias, *Das Alte Testament im Lichte des Alten Orients*, Leipzig, 1930, p. 357.

⁴ *A Glossary of Words used in the Neighbourhood of Sheffield* (1888), p. 144.

Antichi.¹ Cartari tells the story in his section on Juno, and I think it can be shown that Chapman certainly had this section in mind when he was composing the Fifth Sestiad.² Further, I believe that certain passages in this Sestiad which Schoell thought had been taken over from Xylander's Latin translation of Plutarch's *Moralia* have really been taken from Plutarch as rendered by Cartari; a triple comparison of the texts of Xylander, Cartari and Chapman will, I hope, bring this out clearly.³

Chapman has elaborated the tale of Hymen. One such elaboration is his highly figurative description of how love for Hymen woke in the heart of Eucharis. The process is described in mythological terms: Love and Proteus have become one:

And thus came *Loue* with Proteus and his powre,
T'encounter *Eucharis*: first like the flowre
That Junos milke did spring, the siluer Lillie,
He fell on *Hymens* hand....⁴

This piece of mythology is to be found in Cartari:

Iunonem veteres candidis liliis coronabant, quae Iunonias rosas appellabant; nam eius lacte respersa, vt fabulis fertur, candida euaserunt; fabulantur enim, Iouem ad eius dormientis vbera Herculem infantem admouisse, ne eum suo lacte nutritum, tam infecto odio prosequeretur. Sed eum nimis auide lac exsurgentem efficisse vt Dea euigilaret, cognitumque, statim esse proiectum, ita vt lac per caelum spargeretur, indeque ea caeli pars dealbaretur, quam viam lacteam Astrologi vocant; aliquid etiam in terras instillaretur, ex quo lilia candescerent. (p. 132)

Next, we have the passage in which Chapman explains the significance of the five torches carried before the bride in the procession to Juno's temple. Schoell thinks Chapman has been following Plutarch here. I quote the three texts:

Next before her went
Fiue louely children deckt with ornament
Of her sweet colours, bearing Torches by,
For light was held a happie Augurie
Of generation, whose efficient right
Is nothing else but to produce to light.
The od disparent number they did chuse,
To shew the vnion married loues should use,
Since in two equall parts it will not seuer,
But the midst holds one to reioyne it euer,
As common to both parts: men therefore deeme
That equall number Gods doe not esteeme,
Being authors of sweet peace and vnitie,
But pleasing to th'infernall Emperie,
Vnder whose ensignes Wars and Discords fight,
Since an euen number you may disunite
In two parts equall, nought in middle left,
To unite each part from other reft:

¹ Douglas Bush, *Mythology and the Renaissance Tradition in English Poetry* (Minneapolis, 1932), p. 208, n. 23. L. G. Giraldis also told the story, in much the same terms as Cartari, in his *De Deis Gentium... Syntagma* (Lugduni, 1565), pp. 116-17.

² I use Verderius's Latin translation of Cartari's book, *Imagines Deorum* (Lugduni, 1581), which was perhaps even more widely used than the Italian original. The chapter on Juno begins at p. 118.

³ Schoell, *Études sur l'Humanisme Continental en Angleterre* (Paris, 1926), pp. 85-6. In Appendix II, pp. 226-8, Schoell cites the relevant passages from Plutarch, and these I shall quote from him. Bush (p. 208) and Miss Bartlett (in her commentary on this Sestiad) accept Schoell's findings.

⁴ ll. 213-16. I use the text in *The Poems of George Chapman* (ed. Phyllis Brooks Bartlett, New York, 1941).

And five they hold in most especial prise,
 Since t'is the first od number that doth rise
 From the two formost numbers vnitie
 That od and euen are; which are two, and three,
 For one no number is: but thence doth flow
 The powerfull race of number.

(II. 317-40)

Cur in nuptiis quinque faces (cereos ipsi vocant) non plures his aut pauciores accendunt? An quia, vt Varro ait...? An quod cum vtantur compluribus alias etiam numeris, tum alioqui praestantior atque perfectior impar creditus est, tum ad nuptias melius quadrare visus? Par enim diuidi se patitur, partesque eius aequis inter se viribus contendunt. Impar autem omnino diffindi se non fert, sed diuisus semper aliquid relinquit. Inter impares porro omnium maxime congruit nuptiis quinarium. Nam ternarius primus est de imparibus, binarius primus de paribus: ex his tanquam mare et femina miscetur quinarium. Aut potius, quoniam lumen procreationis signum est, mulieres autem ad quinque plerumque pariunt, totidem vtuntur facibus?

Quaestiones Romanae, 263F, 264A

...omnis enim numeri primordium est vnitas.

Ei Apud Delphos, 391A

(From Xylander's Latin Plutarch,
 Schoell, pp. 226-7)

Eis (i.e. the bridal procession) quinque pueri totidem faces praeferebant, vt ex Plutarcho in problematibus nuptialibus habetur; quibus cum nocturnae tenebrae dispellebantur, tum faustum omen afferebatur, fore vt ex illo matrimonio foecunda proles oriretur; generare enim nil aliud est, quam in lucem edere. Hae faces quinarium numerum non excedebant; nam opinantur aliqui, mulierem vno partu ad quintum peruenire posse, ibique sistere. Sed alii, rem subtilius considerantes, veteres numerum imparem in nuptiis adhibuisse dicunt, vt eo pacem atque concordiam submouerent; is enim in partes aequales diuidi nequit, semper aliquo medio numero remanente, qui ambabus communis, eas iterum inter se coniungere possit. Quamobrem caelestes Deos impari numero gaudere dicunt, qui pacis semper sint auctores; inferis vero parem esse gratum, a quibus semper discordia profisciscatur; par enim numerus in duas aequas portiones dispesci potest, nihil reliqui existente, per quod rursus partes in vnum coeant. Ex imparibus veteres ad nuptias optimo iure quinarium desumpserunt; is enim primus est numerus, qui ex primis pari atque impari, inter se coniunctis existeret; vnitas enim numerus non est, sed numerorum principium.

Cartari, p. 129

From a comparison of these texts it is surely quite obvious that Chapman is following Cartari and not drawing directly on Plutarch. Chapman's 'Of generation, whose efficient right Is nothing else but to produce to light' comes straight from Cartari's 'generare enim nil aliud est, quam in lucem edere' (and note that Chapman is following Cartari's order; the equivalent of this comes at the end of the Plutarch passage). The reference to the celestial and the infernal deities does not come in the Plutarch at all. And Schoell has to go to another Plutarch text to find the reference to one not being a number, but rather the beginning of number.

Let us now consider the two other passages which Schoell takes to come from Plutarch:

Before them on an Altar he presented
 Both fire and water: which was first inuented,
 Since to ingenerate euery humane creature,
 And euery other birth produ't by Nature,
 Moysture and heate must mixe: so man and wife
 For humane race must ioyn in Nuptiall life.

(II, 359-64)

Quid causae est cur sponsa in nuptiis iubeatur aquam et ignem tangere? An quod horum, quatenus in elementis ac principiis numerantur, alterum mas est, alterum femina: et ignis principia motionis suggerit, aqua subiecti ac materiae facultatem obtinet? . . . An quod sicvt ignis absque humore nutriendi vi destituitur, estque aridus, aqua autem absque calore sterilis est et ociosa, ita mas quoque et femina seorsim nihil valent, coniunctione eorum vitae consuetudo perfecta a nuptiis rediditur?

Quaestiones Romanae, 263 C, E
(Schoell, p. 227)

Here again Chapman's lines seem closer verbally to Cartari's words; this passage, too, follows immediately on Cartari's discussion of the number five, which Chapman must have read. Schoell's last passage shows one clear trace of Cartari:

Then one of *Junos* Birds, the painted Iay,
He sacrificde, and tooke the gall away.
All which he did behinde the Altar throw,
In signe no bitternes of hate should grow
Twixt married loues, nor any least disdaine.

(ll. 365-9)

Qui Iunoni nuptiali seu pro nube sacrificant, ij fel non cum reliqua faciunt victimam, sed exemptum apud altare abiciunt. Quo instituto legis autor obscure significauit, coniugio nunquam debere bilem iramque interesse.

Coniugalia Praecepta, 141 E
(Scholl, p. 228)

Proponebant praeterea sponsae aquam atque ignem; aut vt ostenderent, haec per se ac seorsim infocunda, hunc quidem cum nihil humiditatis contineat; illam vero, cum sit frigida; sed ad rerum procreationem, caliditatem, atque humiditatem inter se coire debere; eodemque pacto ad prolem conficiendam, viri atque vxoris coniunctione opus esse. . . .

Cartari, p. 130

. . . Iunonique Iugali sacrificantes, fel ex victima extrahebant, idque post altare proiciebant, vt ostenderent inter coniuges nihil amatoris intercedere, quod est, eos vacare omni dissidio, atque odio debere.

Cartari, p. 133

Chapman's 'behinde the Altar' is Cartari's 'post altare', and his last two lines are, if anything, closer to Cartari than to Plutarch.

Other details in Chapman's description of the marriage rites are to be found in this same chapter of Cartari's book. Take this passage in which Chapman presents the priest of Juno and the ritual he observes:

On his right arme did hang a skarlet vaile,
And from his shoulders to the ground did traile,
On either side, Ribands of white and blew;
With the red vaile he hid the bashfull hew
Of the chaste Bride, to shew the modest shame,
In coupling with a man should grace a dame.
Then tooke he the disparent Silks, and tide
The Louers by the wasts, and side to side,
In token that thereafter they must binde
In one selfe sacred knot each others minde.

The bride's red veil is twice mentioned by Cartari. First, in giving an account of a statue of Juno Sponsa, he says:

Itaque in templo . . . ei simulacrum erat positum, quod sponsae speciem referret, quae forte flammeo obnubebatur; quod velum ita a flammeo colore, qui est ruber, dicebatur, quia scilicet recens nuptae ingenuo quodam debeant rubore perfundi. (p. 129)

And towards the end of the chapter he writes of Hymen:

Pingebatur . . . coronatus floribus, et amaraco, dextra facem tenens, sinistra flammeum (lutei velaminis id genus) quo velo nouae nuptae se tegebant; idque flammeum

vocabatur, quo boni omnis caussa eas velari solitas Sex. Pompeius tradit, idcirco quod eo assidue Flaminica vteretur; cui divortium facere non licebat. Sed tamen non incommode id referri potest ad sponsae ruborem atque verecundiam innuendam, quam idem dicamus licet cum Pudore, quem antiqui tamquam Deum venerabantur: quare ei Athenis altare erat dicatum.... (pp. 136-7)

We have been led, then, from the red veil to the goddess Pudor and her worship at Athens; this, too, we find in Chapman:

And so respected
Was bashfulness in *Athens*: it erected
To chaste *Agneia*, which is Shamefastnesse,
A sacred Temple, holding her a Goddess. (ll. 373-6)¹

To return to the priest: the ceremony of binding the man and woman together is also in Cartari:

...Iugae Iunonis ara fuit Romae in vico, qui ideo Iugarius dictus est, vt Festus ait; quod ad hanc aram, veteri ritu nubentes vinculis iungebantur in omen futurae concordiae. (pp. 132-3)

Implements for spinning, and a fleece, were also carried in the bridal procession:

Next did go
A noble Matron that did spinning beare,
A huswives rock and spindle, and did weare
A Weathers skin, with all the snowy fleece,
To intimate that euen the daintiest peece,
And noblest borne dame should industrious bee:
That which does good, disgraceth no degree. (ll. 340-45)

Compare Cartari:

Ferebatur etiam colus atque fusus: itemque in mariti domum per ouis vellus nupta transibat.... (p. 130)

...Thalassio, iuxta Varronis sententiam, signum sit lanificij: nam Thalassionem vocabant quasillum vas vtique lanificiis aptum: vt hac voce saepius repetita, sponsam admonerent, quodnam eius esset munus futurum: id etiam Plutarchus in Problematicis confirmat, referens quoque, quod superius de colo, atque fuso, atque transitu per vellus ouillum diximus.... (p. 134)

Cartari goes on to explain the use of the words *Caius* and *Caia* by the bride and bridegroom during the ceremony: this commemorates the virtues of the famous lady who was the wife of Tarquinius Priscus and who personified the Roman ideal of the wife:

mulier sane sapiens, atque omni virtutum genere praedita, quaeque domum summa cum providentia administravit. Quare Plinius ex Varrone refert, Romae magna cum religione eius fusus, atque colum fuisse seruatum; crepidas aliqui addunt. Hincque factum esse asserunt, vt sponsa, vbi primum viri domum ingrederetur, secum colum vna cum lana, atque fuso afferret, vt scilicet se ad virtutem mulieris huius imitandum excitaret.... (p. 134)

The consummation of the marriage is also attended with ritual:

The custome was that euery maid did weare,
During her maidenhead, a silken Sphere
About her waste, aboue her inmost weede,
Knit with *Mineruas* knot, and that was freedde

¹ Cf. also Giraldi, op. cit. p. 40. L. C. Martin was, then, mistaken in thinking that 'Chapman is perhaps himself responsible for this dedication of *Agneia* or Purity' (*Marlowe's Poems*, ed. L. C.

Martin (London, 1931), p. 122, note on line 375 of this *Sestiad*). Chapman has given the Greek equivalent of the name 'Pudor' in keeping with the other Greek names he uses.

By the faire Bridegrome on the marriage night,
 With many ceremonies of delight:
 And yet eternisde *Hymens* tender Bride,
 To suffer it dissolu'd so sweetly cride.
 The maids that heard, so lou'd, and did adore her,
 They wisht with all their hearts to suffer for her.
 So had the Matrons, that with Confits stood
 About the chamber, such affectionate blood,
 And so true feeling of her harmeles paines,
 That euery one a showre of Confits raines.
 For which the Brideyouths scrambling on the ground,
 In noise of that sweet haile her cryes were drowned. (ll. 389-404)

The knot with which this girdle was tied was usually known as the knot of Hercules, and the girdle was supposed to be made of wooll:

Cingulo insuper nupta cingebatur, quod vir in lecto soluebat. Factum id ex lana ouis Sextus Pompeius dicit. . . . Cingulum id Herculano nodo vinctum, vir ominis caussa soluebat; vt sic ipse felix in suscipiendis liberis esset, sicut Hercules fuit, qui lxx liberos reliquit.

It was, however, perhaps from Cartari's next sentence that Chapman got the idea of calling the knot Minerva's:

In quo Deam Virginensem vir inuocabat; qui fasciis virginalibus feliciter soluendis praesse credebatur. . . . (p. 135)

As for the shower of 'confits', this is what Cartari had written:

Mariti nuces spargebant, pueris magno cum strepitu eas colligentibus, ne sponsae clamor, dum fasciam virginalem sibi solui nollet, a circumstantibus audiretur. (p. 135)

Why Chapman should have rendered 'nuces' as 'confits' is hard to say.

This is not, of course, the whole story about the sources which Chapman drew on for the Fifth Sestiad—and I, myself, think it likely that Chapman was aware of still other accounts of Roman marriage ritual.¹ Yet the occurrence of the Hymen story in a context containing so much else that appears in Chapman seems to put it beyond reasonable doubt that Chapman had read this chapter of Cartari, while his verbal indebtedness to Cartari's version of what Plutarch had said, and his inclusion of details that are only in Cartari and not in Plutarch, show that in this instance, at any rate, he was getting information from the *Moralia* at second hand. This last point may profitably serve to remind us how difficult it is to pin down with any precision the source of an Elizabethan poet's knowledge of Classical antiquities. We have to consider not only Plutarch, or any other prime authority, but the vast and too little known mass of Humanist dissertations, and the diffusion of the knowledge contained in them, together with the facile reiteration of references to the ancient sources, through such popular hand-books as the *Imagines Deorum*.

D. J. GORDON

LIVERPOOL

¹ I shall have more to say about such accounts in an article on Ben Jonson's *Hymenaei* which I hope to publish shortly.

THE DUMB SHOW AND THE 'MOUSE TRAP'

There is no convincing evidence that Hamlet's 'Marry, this is miching mallecho, it means mischief' is spoken in anger.¹ Hamlet, aware that Polonius and Claudius are eavesdropping, deliberately foxes both them and Ophelia by giving an explanation that is obvious to the point of bathos.² Only after the entry of the Prologue is Hamlet undeniably angry. 'The players cannot keep counsel, they'll tell all' is a bitter aside introducing some ironic comments on the players' facility for providing explanations. Hamlet is fearful lest the seeming Presenter should explain the dumb show, and his relief at the posy prologue is apparent.

If this interpretation is correct, Hamlet must have forbidden the players to introduce a Presenter, and therefore he must have had foreknowledge of the dumb show. For it is clear that the customary Presenter's explanation of the dumb show would ruin Hamlet's plan. This, however, is not all. Hamlet himself intends to play the Presenter so that he may lead Claudius by well-timed, pregnant comments to the alarming discovery, at the right moment, that the play itself explains the dumb show. Thus Hamlet's skilful chorus work during the play not only contains the kind of information to be expected in a Presenter's speech, but it also plays a most significant part in springing the trap at the right time.³

Again, the dumb show is unique in presenting the argument of the play it precedes.⁴ Assuming, therefore, that it has a purpose in *Hamlet*, and is not merely vestigial, it is highly probable that it is unique that it may achieve that purpose. Its existence as a unique dumb show outside *Hamlet* is improbable. As the players had no motive whatever for introducing it, Hamlet alone must be responsible for it. In other words, the dumb show is an integral part of the 'Mouse Trap'.

The reactions of Claudius to the dumb show can only be conjectured; he gives no sign. If he does recognize its similarity to his crime, why does he not take fright? I think it must be admitted at once that Claudius does recognize the similarity. Unless the presentation of the dumb show is obscured by highly conventionalized miming, and there is no evidence of this, he must be dense beyond belief if he misses the resemblance. There are, however, a number of reasons for believing that he attaches no significance to what he sees.

Claudius has no reason to suspect that a trap is being set for him; he is confident that no one could have discovered his crime. The play being presented before him is obviously not a new play, it is one from the repertory of a troupe of actors. Any coincidences, therefore, between events in the dumb show and events in Claudius's life are naturally accidental. In general terms, the ingredients of the dumb show, love and murder in high places, are commonplace.⁵ Moreover, the method of poisoning is well known. Lightborne in *Edward II* refers to the insertion of poison in the ears as if it were an established method of dealing with sleeping victims:

Or whilst one is asleep, to take a quill
And blowe a little powder in his eares.

(2366-7)

Poison administered by the ear was rumoured to have caused the death of Francesco

¹ Alice Walker, 'Miching Malecho and the play scene in "Hamlet"' (*Mod. Lang. Rev.* xxxi, 513 ff.).

² Cf. Antony's description of the crocodile, *Antony and Cleopatra*, II, 7.

³ Not to mention its brilliant irony.

⁴ *Rev. English Stud.* xi, 385.

⁵ Forsythe, *The Relations of Shirley's Plays to the Elizabethan Drama* (1914), contains an extensive list of plays with these themes.

Maria I della Rovere in 1538,¹ and of Francis II of France.² So frequent were rumours of poisonings, and so well versed in the arts of the poisoner were the Elizabethan courtiers,³ that Claudius would not feel any suspicion at the use of one of the accepted methods of poisoning a sleeping victim, even though he himself had used the same method under similar circumstances.

Finally, this similarity occurs in a dumb show. Now dumb shows are by nature inexplicable until a Presenter relates them to the ensuing play. The point of Hamlet's jibe at the groundlings is that they understand mere noise and, ironically enough, dumb shows where the significance is deliberately withheld from them. Shakespeare warns us again after the dumb show, 'What means this, my lord?' that this dumb show is inexplicable. If Claudius does speculate on the meaning of the dumb show, he may well decide that the changeableness of woman's love is the theme. In any case, if Pearn's findings are correct,⁴ Claudius will naturally assume that the dumb show does not contain the argument of the play.

Claudius, therefore, has little reason for being suspicious of the dumb show, and less still for taking fright.

Hamlet's plan has the audacity of genius; indeed, there is a touch of madness in its daring. Hamlet allows his victim a swift glimpse of the whole of the Mouse Trap in the dumb show. He dispenses with the normal Presenter so that Claudius sees a truly inexplicable dumb show.⁵ Hamlet himself takes the role of the Presenter, for not only does he want Claudius to know that there is offensive matter in the play, that it is based on a murder that happened in real life, and that the murderer is 'Nephew to the King', but, most important of all, he wants Claudius to discover these things at precisely the right moment. In the moment of illumination Claudius makes not one discovery but several. He recognizes the representation of his own crime; that the dumb show is the argument, and hence his former discovery receives complete confirmation; that Hamlet knows all, and as an avenger is threatening his life; that, from the last discovery, the dumb show may perform the legitimate but terrifying part of a summary of the events preceding the action of the play, which may become reality at any moment. All these, together with the emotional effect of Lucianus's words, comprise the 'cunning of the scene' whereby Claudius betrays himself in flight.

J. H. WALTER

GRIMSBY

THE STUDY OF ARMENIAN IN SOVIET ARMENIA

The Armenian language has been very thoroughly studied by Armenian, Russian and European linguists since the very early days of comparative linguistics. The kinship of Armenian with both the Indo-European languages and those of the Caucasian (Japhetic) system has long attracted the attention of specialists in various languages. A study has been made of Old Armenian ('Grabar'), Middle Armenian, two modern literary languages (East and West Armenian) and some

¹ Dennistoun, *Memoirs of Dukes of Urbino*, III (1851), 72.

² Packard, *Life and Times of Ambroise Paré* (1922), p. 63. There is also the probable source of the idea, Pliny.

³ C. J. S. Thompson, *Poison Mysteries in History, Romance and Crime* (1923), gives a popular, but accurately documented, account of the astonishing prevalence of poisonings

and fear of poisoning during the Renaissance period.

⁴ *Rev. English Stud.* xi, 385.

⁵ The interpolation of the posy prologue by the players I ascribe to their anxiety to gain royal favour. At a court performance the omission of a humble prologue might be construed unfavourably. By its brevity, if not its lameness, they hope to escape Hamlet's wrath.

thirty-eight dialects. Prior to the October Revolution, however, the study of the Armenian language was mainly of an academic character and did not pursue any concrete, for example, pedagogical, aims. Things changed completely after Armenia achieved state independence in the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic. The building up of the state and the development of Armenian economy and culture necessitated a rapid development of the language. Legislation, technical, medical, agricultural, military and other literature required the compilation of special dictionaries of terminology which in turn made the investigation of a number of language problems essential. Language problems became the subject of research for the specialist and of extensive discussion by the public. A number of Armenian research institutions, with a large group of linguists, are engaged in the study of the language. The more active institutions in this respect are the University, the Institute of Language and Literature and the Pedagogical Institute, where the language is studied historically and in its modern form.

The history of the Armenian language is studied mainly by the following professors: Dr R. Acharyan, Dr G. Kapantsyan and Dr A. Garibyan. Professor Acharyan is a well-known linguist who compiled a seven-volume *Fundamental Dictionary of the Armenian Language*, with a comprehensive linguistic introduction. It was an exceptionally brilliant piece of lexicography and was highly praised by two leading specialists, N. Y. Marr and A. Meillet. Professor Acharyan has also published the first volume of his *History of the Armenian Language*, containing a detailed description of all the elements borrowed from other languages that went to make up Armenian. Professor Kapantsyan's valuable research on the Chaldean and Hittite languages, undertaken with a view to determining elements common to those languages and Armenian, has brought to light many facts which prove the dual origin of the Armenian language.

Professor Garibyan's *Introduction to the Study of the Armenian Language* approaches the subject from a different aspect. The author of the *Introduction* gives us an exceptionally interesting picture of the development of the Armenian language, and connects it up with the social-historical development of the Armenian people.

The theoretical study of the Armenian language is covered by the books of Professor M. Abegyan and Dr G. Sevak. Many years ago Abegyan published his *Theory of the Armenian Language* and *Armenian Prosody*, the former summarizing ten years' research and the latter analysing the theory of Armenian poetry over a period of 2400 years. Dr Sevak studies Modern Armenian from the standpoint of the parallel development of language and thought processes.

Armenian dialectology also occupies an important place in the works of Professors Acharyan and Garibyan. A huge amount of accurately systematized material is contained in their monographs on the Novo-Nakhichevan, Marag, Zoks, Constantinople and Julfin dialects. These monographs are a continuation of the authors' papers on Armenian dialectology, published before the revolution.

While working on the classification of dialects Professor Garibyan discovered a number of subsidiary dialects which had not previously been noted by linguists. Since the war began Professor Garibyan has published a comprehensive *Course of Armenian Dialectology* in which he summarizes all the work that has been done in this field.

The Armenian literary language of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is being extensively studied. Papers by Dr A. Terteryan on Hachatur Abovyan, the founder of modern Armenian literature, and M. Nalbandyan, the revolutionary

and educationalist of the 60's of the last century, deal with their works from the linguistic point of view. Dr Kanayan published a monograph on the work of A. Isaakyan, Soviet Armenia's greatest poet. Isaakyan continues in the best Armenian traditions, introducing the dialects of the people into the literary language and employing material from Old and Middle Armenian.

Lexicographers are working on dictionaries of a general nature and also on a number of specialized vocabularies. Dr S. Malkhasyants has compiled a comprehensive two-volume *Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Armenian Language*, a work comparable with that of Professor Acharyan. Malkhasyants sums up his fifty years' research work in this dictionary. The Institute of Language and Literature is at present working on a dictionary of the Armenian language under the guidance of Professor Garibyan. Of the specialized dictionaries issued during past years special mention must be made of the dictionary of medical terms compiled by a leading anatomist, Dr V. Artsruni, and the dictionary of military terminology compiled by Professor M. Abegyan. Both dictionaries were the result of many years' research work in the sphere of all the Armenian literary languages.

The study of the Armenian language occupies an important place in the research work of Armenian scientists. The Armenian language, rich in every respect, has had an exceptionally fruitful period of development under Soviet power. The language is becoming richer day by day both in vocabulary and in structure, a fact which makes its all-round study a matter of immediate necessity. Such a study of the language, however, only became possible when the Armenian people had established their own state and were able to organize a number of higher educational establishments and research institutions. The Armenian Republic now has its own Academy of Sciences, a fact which opens up wide vistas for the future study of the Armenian language.

БИБЛИОГРАФИЯ

1. Ачарян, Р., 'Подробный Словарь Армянского Языка,' с. 1, по 8-й том, 8194 стр., Ереван, 1926-35 г.г.
2. Ачарян, Р., 'История Армянского Языка,' том I, стр. 356, Ереван, 1940 г.
3. Абегян, М., 'Армянская Просодия,' 452 стр., Ереван, 1933 г.
4. Гарибян, А., 'Введение к изучению Армянского Языка,' 268 стр., Ереван, 1937 г.
5. Гарибян, А., 'Краткий Курс Армянского Дialecta,' 374 стр., Ереван, 1941 г.
6. Севак, Г., 'Теория Современного Армянского Языка,' том I, стр. 231, Ереван, 1935 г.
7. Ачарян, Р., 'Агульский Дialect,' 400 стр., Ереван, 1935 г.
8. Ачарян, Р., 'Ново-Нихичеванский Дialect,' 464 стр., Ереван, 1935 г.
9. Ачарян, Р., 'Марагский Дialect,' 452 стр., Ереван, 1926 г.
10. Гарибян, А., 'Новые Группы Армянского Дialecta,' 187 стр., Ереван, 1939 г.
11. Капанцян, Г., 'Хитетские Боги и Армяне,' Ереван, 1940 г., Труды Государственного Университета, том 14, стр. 74.
12. Капанцян, Г., 'Историческое и Лингвистическое Значение Названий Древней Армени,' Ереван, 1940 г., Труды Государственного Университета, том 14, стр. 109.

JOSEPH KUSIKYAN

EREVAN, U.S.S.R.

EDITORIAL NOTES

(a) LONDRA TÜRK HALKEVİ

The Turkish People's House in London, at 14 Fitzhardinge Street, W. 1, has now for two years served as a cultural link between England and her ally, with great success. It is a centre of many, and varied, activities on behalf of all interested in Turkish life, art and literature. In particular, it furnishes regular classes in the Turkish language, which are open to all, free of charge. Further information may be had from the Secretary, Bay Adnan Mahir, at the above address.

(b) RUSSIAN LINGUISTICS IN WAR TIME

A telegram from Professor Grigory Vinokur, received while this number was at press, requests us to delete from the Bibliography of his article (Vol. XXXIX, April 1944, pp. 172-7) entries 20-25, under the name Selishchev, as these are not his works but articles in various publications.

C. J. SISSON
Editor

REVIEWS

The Statistical Study of Literary Vocabulary. By G. UDNY YULE. Cambridge: University Press. 1944. x+306 pp. 25s.

This is a fascinating book. It is true that some sections (e.g. pp. 98-9) look rather formidable, and perhaps not many literary students will follow the statistical analysis in detail—certainly it is out of my star—but if the reader is content to go ahead, taking the mathematics on trust (Mr Yule as an F.R.S. and a former Reader in Statistics at Cambridge) and putting up with a little harmless symbolism, he should have no difficulty in following the general argument.

It all began when Mr Yule developed an interest in the controversy over the authorship of *De Imitatione Christi*. Dissatisfied with previous investigations, he decided to make a fresh analysis, on lines suggested by statistical science, of the verbal structure of the *Imitatio* and of comparable works among the acknowledged writings of Thomas à Kempis and Gerson. I may say at once that the results showed at every point such resemblances and contrasts as practically to rule out Gerson's claim, though they did not prove that Thomas had written the book. Mr Yule states the position with characteristic caution (p. 278): 'The results, it seems to me, almost exclude the possibility of Gerson as the author, but are entirely consistent with the authorship of Thomas à Kempis. One cannot of course go further and say that the authorship of Thomas à Kempis is proved, for statistical data can only balance the claims of one author against those of another'; which is I suppose true of all internal evidence.

But this turned out not to be the main interest of the investigation. To quote Mr Yule again (p. 281): 'I hope, however, that the methods developed will not be used solely or even mainly for endeavours to solve controverted questions of authorship or chronological order or the like. They are methods for studying language-in-use, as distinct from the anatomized bones of language in the dictionary.' What the suggested analysis gives us is a picture, from one point of view at any rate, of the distinctive manner in which an author uses his vocabulary.

The idea underlying the method is that what is most characteristic of a writer is the way in which he mixes the commoner and rarer elements of his vocabulary. The collection of data for this study needs consideration. It is in any case a formidable task, and if the writings to be examined are at all extensive, a selection of average or random passages will have to be made. Further, if the whole vocabulary is included, the characteristic features will tend to be swamped in a flood of conjunctions, prepositions, auxiliary verbs, and the like. Mr Yule's investigations were in the main confined to nouns, as probably the most distinctive element in an author's vocabulary; but experiments with verbs and adjectives suggested that these would yield analogous results. The field being determined, all nouns in it were tabulated according to their frequency of occurrence: first, once-used nouns, so many; next, twice-used nouns, so many; continuing down to a tail of usually single nouns each used a different large number of times. This at once revealed a quite unexpected fact: in all observed cases the once-used nouns form by far the most numerous class. This is not in itself surprising, for it only means that in any moderate sample the words actually used are only a small fraction of the words-at-risk; that is, of the author's whole vocabulary. But the actual figures are remarkable. Of course, if the size of the sample were increased, the preponderance of once-used words would tend to diminish; still, it looks as though, even in the case of an author with a relatively small vocabulary, the sample would have to be uncommonly large before they lost their pride of place.

The falling off in number as the frequency rises proceeds irregularly, and the course it follows, so it is reasonably contended, is characteristic of the author. Now, from the data of the table statistical science can extract a number of quantities or ratios that express features of the course followed or in other words the frequency distribution, such as the 'mean', the 'standard deviation' or dispersion about the mean, and the 'coefficient of variation'. It is true that none of these can be directly characteristic of the author, since they will all vary with the size of the sample. But Mr Yule has been able to determine one rather complicated quantity indicative of the form of the frequency distribution and independent of the size of the sample within reasonable limits. This quantity he terms the Characteristic and denotes by K : it may roughly be said to measure the 'concentration' of the vocabulary, the degree to which the author relies upon the commoner words. It appears that the value of K for different works by the same author may have a rather large range (varying presumably mainly with the subject) so that it is evident that the ranges for different authors may overlap: at the same time different authors may have K 's of widely different values and ranges. In four selected essays by Macaulay K was found to range roughly from 18 to 34, in four works by Bunyan from 56.5 to 88; in the *Imitatio* it proved to be just over 84, in the miscellaneous works of Thomas à Kempis nearly 60, in Gerson's theological writings 36. Thus Gerson is not far from Macaulay's low K -range, and both the *Imitatio* and Thomas come within the higher range of Bunyan.¹ For comparison we may note that K is 141.5 for the Gospel of St John in Basic English and 161.5 or 178 (on slightly different counts) in the Authorized Version.

One chapter deals with the alphabetical distribution of the vocabulary in Bunyan and Macaulay. This shows some surprising discrepancies: in Macaulay there is a heavy excess of nouns beginning with A, E, I; in Bunyan with B, F, H, W. Examination, however, shows that this is merely the result of the preponderance of Latin over English stock in Macaulay's vocabulary. In the samples examined practically 44 per cent of Bunyan's vocabulary was found to be of Germanic derivation and 56 per cent of Latin-Romance; whereas of Macaulay's under 27 per cent was Germanic and over 73 per cent Latin-Romance.² When the two strains were sorted out the distribution proved reasonably congruent. Another interesting though not unexpected discovery was that in Bunyan monosyllabic nouns formed over 70 per cent of the total on vocabulary and over 82 per cent on occurrences, the corresponding figures for Macaulay being roughly 61 and 67 per cent.

While he admits that the impression formed by a reader respecting the richness or poorness of an author's vocabulary may be correct, Mr Yule gives reason for supposing that it is likely often to be erroneous. What is a rich vocabulary? Mr Yule is inclined to believe that the only precise meaning that can be given to the relative richness of the vocabularies of two authors is the ratio W_1/W_2 : where W is a writer's 'word-hoard', that is, his total potential vocabulary, all the words that are consciously or unconsciously in his mind, and may therefore possibly, however improbably, emerge in his writing. This suffers from the disadvantage of being quite indeterminable. But I venture to suggest that when we speak of the richness of an author's vocabulary we do not *intend* something that we cannot possibly know. And I think that it is possible (and usual) to give to the expression another

¹ Actually such comparisons are improper, for a group of works will normally have a lower K than will each work individually. Thus four selected works by Thomas à Kempis (out of eighteen that were drawn on for the whole sample) showed a range of 67 to nearly 114: on the other hand the K for Macaulay's four works taken together is only 20, for Bunyan's a little

over 51. This liability of K to vary with the range of subject seems rather to interfere with its use as a test of authorship.

² Excluding in each case a relatively small number of nouns of uncertain and miscellaneous derivation. Also Bunyan works his Germanic stock harder than Macaulay does his.

equally definite meaning, namely, the determinable ratio S_0/S_1 : where S_0 is the total vocabulary (number of distinct words) and S_1 the occurrences (total number of times they are used) in the sample. (The sample, of course, is simply the field of observation, whether selected passages, a complete work, or the whole of an author's writings.) This Mr Yule describes (p. 14) as 'the *apparent* richness of the vocabulary in the given sample'. It will, of course, differ with the size of the sample, diminishing indefinitely as the size increases; but for samples of similar size from different authors it affords a ready means of comparison. For the four essays of Macaulay the range of $1000 S_0/S_1$ is 392 to 321 (rather wide), for the four works of Bunyan 258 to 248 (lower and much narrower); for Gerson its value is 214, for Thomas à Kempis 171, for the *Imitatio* 142; for St John's Gospel it is in A.V. 157 and in Basic 96. A statistician will naturally prefer a quantity independent of the size of the sample; but since all work of this sort is likely to be done on selected samples, there can, for purposes of comparison, be little objection to a quantity dependent on their size, so long as this is carefully regulated. Mr Yule himself (p. 245) speaks of 'the high vocabulary of Gerson', apparently in this sense.

There is much of interest in Mr Yule's study that cannot be touched on in a brief review. It is a work of infinite patience, of great technical ingenuity, and of the strictest integrity in its determination to maintain objectivity and to press no point too far: it is also not without touches of humour. There is an excellent index, in which however symbols and technical terms might have been rather more freely entered. Anyone interested in linguistics will find the book a storehouse of suggestive ideas; though, as Mr Yule recognizes, a far wider application of his methods will be needed to give any general view of the manner in which authors play upon their instrument of language. As it is, perhaps not the least service Mr Yule has rendered is that he has brought into clear view the many difficult problems that arise in the attempt to apply statistical methods to literary works, and so may possibly dissuade amateurs from rushing headlong to fallacious conclusions or indulging in such rash suggestions as I was myself guilty of a moment ago.

W. W. GREG

PETWORTH

Anglo-Saxon England. By F. M. STENTON. (*The Oxford History of England*, vol. II.) Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1943. x+748 pp. 21s.

This volume has been eagerly awaited and its importance for Anglo-Saxon studies cannot be overestimated. It is an astounding feat to give in so relatively small a compass such a full, balanced account of a complex period. No aspect of the subject is ignored, full weight is given to various types of evidence, and due recognition is accorded to the work of other scholars. The author is fully at home with the vernacular as well as the Latin sources, and he brings to the work an unrivalled knowledge of charters and of place-names. He has made effective use of the difficult writer, Æthelweard, and of other rather neglected sources, such as the panegyric on Athelstan contained in William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Regum* and the Northumbrian annals embedded in Roger of Wendover's *Flores Historiarum*. Material from his own important contributions to Anglo-Saxon history is here conveniently collected and placed in relation to a synthesis of the whole period; in addition, many facts and interpretations are presented for the first time; but, though the sum of new matter is considerable, what is even more impressive is the author's power of giving a convincing picture of hitherto vague or obscure conditions, not so much by the production of new material as by his 'astonishing power of co-ordinating the fragments of information', to borrow his own phrase in appreciation of Bede.

Here one can select for illustration only a few salient new features. By attaching more importance to the evidence of Procopius, and by postulating a duplicate recording of the same events under different dates in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, he is able to reconcile Gildas's statement on the peaceful interval after *Mons Badonicus* with other sources. His earlier conception (*English Hist. Rev.* XXXIII, 433 ff.) of the overlordship of the Southumbrians is developed, and it offers an intelligible explanation both of the claims of a *Bretwalda* and of the anomalous nature of some Mercian synods. The shifting ownership of the lands in the Upper Thames valley, shown in his *Early History of the Abbey of Abingdon*, is brought into relation with Mercian and West Saxon history as a whole. But undoubtedly the greatest contribution to the pre-Viking Age period is the coherent account of the reign of Offa, and especially of the causes of the creation of the shortlived Lichfield archbishopric. The suggestion that Otford was a Kentish victory makes the politics of the reign more intelligible. Further light is thrown on the history of Mercia by the realization of its recovery, under Wiglaf, after its defeat by Egbert. Some details from charters, Æthelweard, etc., add to our knowledge of the Viking invasions and should also serve to remind us how purely southern are the interests of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle at this date. For example, it is only from a charter that we hear of Danes near the Wrekin in 855. Although the account of Alfred is necessarily limited to a few pages, it gives a more vivid and consistent picture than many fuller treatments. The author appreciates the intellectual curiosity and 'sense of imponderable values' revealed in works that have too often been regarded merely as examples of pedagogic zeal.

For the post-Alfredian period this work will fill a great gap, for no general history is recent enough to have used modern evidence. It becomes increasingly difficult to select isolated matters for comment where new estimations and interpretations abound. One might notice how tenth-century political history is given more meaning by an appreciation of the importance of the Battle of Tettenhall, and how the explanation of Edgar's deferred coronation here suggested has surely cleared up a minor problem of Anglo-Saxon history. The intricate, and often obscure, politics of the reigns of Ethelred, the Danish kings and Edward the Confessor are set out with a rare lucidity and with a freedom from prejudice not always brought to this subject in the past. Finally, the work ends with a masterly account of the Conqueror's reign and its results, and no one is likely to dispute the great gain to Anglo-Saxon studies of continuing past the artificial date 1066. This makes it possible to show the continuity of Anglo-Saxon institutions—though without underestimating the importance of the modifications introduced by the conquerors—and to include an account of Domesday Book, which, among other things, tried to describe the condition of the land on the day on which King Edward was alive and dead.

Professor Stenton's book is not merely a political history. It traces also the development of Anglo-Saxon society, giving an account which in its main lines agrees with the findings of Chadwick, Liebermann, Vinogradoff, etc., and is remarkable for the imaginative insight which combines the details into a convincing whole. Attention may be drawn to a clear treatment of the *folcland* problem. The interpretation here given, 'land from which the king drew foodrents and customary services', allows of a less-forced interpretation of the compound itself and fits well with the fact that the only two contexts where the word is used technically have reference to the king. *Bocland* was distinguished from *folcland* not only by immunity from these rents and services but by the freedom with which it could be alienated and it was doubtless the need to obtain this right in the interests of the Church that brought the *boc* into being.

Many other matters could be singled out, but certainly no evaluation of this book can ignore the treatment of the Scandinavian element in English society.

No one is better qualified than the author to pronounce on its extent and importance, as his past work has shown, and an excellent survey is given here, which, by skilful use of place-name evidence, even allows one to glimpse the actual process of settling a Viking army in an English district. There is one problem in this connexion not touched on: if Middle English scholars are right in localizing texts of the so-called 'Katherine Group' in the West Midlands, there must have been a considerable influx of Scandinavian settlers into an area where their presence in large numbers is not normally assumed, for these texts contain many Scandinavian words in the form to be expected if they were borrowed during the Old English period. But the assessment of the historical bearing of this fact should perhaps wait until Middle English dialect boundaries can be drawn with greater precision than is possible at present.

The scope of the work did not allow detailed discussion of controversial matters, and here and there individual scholars will differ from the conclusions reached, but mainly on minor matters, for all will recognize the balanced judgement and reasonableness that pervade the book, and the sense of proportion which has dictated what should go in and what be omitted. It might have been worth mentioning that the Welsh annals record three occasions of armed English interference in Wales during the reign of Ethelred, but probably these expeditions were on a small scale. It seems doubtful to me whether one should accept the authority of the *Historia Regum*, ascribed to Symeon of Durham, when deciding on the date of the Battle of Carham. The relation between this work, called by P. Hunter Blair (*Archæologia Eliana*, 4th series, xvi, 87) 'a mass of unedited material', and other sources for Northumbrian history still remains to be worked out, as Professor Stenton would be the first to recognize. On the other hand, he is doubtless correct when he accepts the fact of Edgar's cession of Lothian to Kenneth on the authority of Roger of Wendover. This is supported by the anonymous tract *De Primo Saxonum Adventu*, whereas the variant account that it was acquired as a result of the Battle of Carham, favoured by most recent Scottish historians, occurs only in the *De Obsessione Dunelmi*, an unreliable document that historians have treated with more respect than it deserves.

The book contains a valuable selective bibliography, which includes a clearer outline of the present state of knowledge concerning the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle than can be obtained anywhere else, and a penetrating and generous appreciation of great scholars such as Stubbs, Round, *etc.* All who use the book will be grateful to Mrs Stenton for supplying an admirable index. If any general criticism of the work can be made, it is that the economy in footnotes may have been overdone. For example, the authority for the circumstantial account of Alfred's action at the River Lea could have been given, or the implication that the *Wanderer* is really two poems might have been amplified. But these are details, and it would have been easy to err in the opposite direction and overweight with discussion of minor points a book which, in addition to all its other merits, possesses that of being pre-eminently readable. One reviewer, at least, found it difficult to lay it down.

D. WHITELOCK

OXFORD

Women Healers in Medieval Life and Literature. By MURIEL JOY HUGHES. New York: King's Crown Press. 1943. xii+180 pp. \$2.00.

The history of medieval medicine is yet to be written. All workers in this field know how limited, inaccurate and wanting is the evidence when they come to investigate any particular matter. For example, we have no adequate history of hospitals or of the medical profession in the Middle Ages. The struggle between

superstition and science has been charted by Professor Lynn Thorndike in his *History of Magic and Experimental Science*, but much has yet to be done to fill in the outline which his four admirable volumes provide. One of the merits of Miss M. J. Hughes's *Women Healers in Medieval Life and Literature* is that it helps to fill in the picture, so far as women are concerned, from the eleventh to the end of the fifteenth century, with particular attention to conditions in England.

Miss Hughes, however, does herself less than justice in her title, for her book is concerned with a good deal more than women's activities alone. For example, her chapter on 'Academic Medicine' gives a concise account of what was taught and practised in academic medicine in the later Middle Ages. She sets out with admirable clarity the curriculum which the schools of the University evolved, and shows how it was based on the older works of Galen, Hippocrates, Avicenna, etc., with glosses and commentaries by writers such as Arnold of Villanova, Peter of Abano and others. The growth of the art of surgery and the division between physicians and surgeons in the thirteenth century leads her to discuss the great surgeons Saliceto, Lanfranc, de Chauliac and our own John Arderne.

Her study, however, is mainly concerned with women healers and their practices, both in history and in literature, and her chapters on 'Some famous women healers in Literature' and on 'Lay women healers' as well as those on 'Women practitioners', 'Medieval midwives and nurses' bring together a considerable body of evidence, and help us to realize more clearly than hitherto the part played by women in the healing art. Many of their practices and cures leave much to be desired, and fill us with horror for their patients, but as Miss Hughes reminds us: 'To put oneself in the hands of one of these amateur healers was doubtless to take risks. One still takes the risks of a wrong diagnosis and mistaken treatment when one consults the great professional specialists.'

The pages in her treatise devoted to the aid given by MSS. to these lay healers could well have been extended, for there can be no doubt (as Miss Hughes realizes) that current medical practice was made available by consultation of the writings of such men as Lanfranc or Arderne. She mentions, for example, two English translations of gynecological treatises, but her list could be considerably increased.¹ In this and in every other field of medical knowledge, the fourteenth, and more especially the fifteenth century, saw much material made available in the vernacular for just such healers as are Miss Hughes's concern.²

The book is written in an attractive easy style, the matter well arranged, with two useful appendixes giving the names of some women practitioners between 1100 and 1500, and a glossary of herbs mentioned in the text. There is also a full and accurate bibliography. The frontispiece is not very clearly identified, but in fact comes from a manuscript executed at Bruges in 1470, and now in the British Museum, Royal. 15D. 1.

H. S. BENNETT

CAMBRIDGE

The Globe Playhouse. Its Design and Equipment. By JOHN CRANFORD ADAMS. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1942. xiv + 420 pp. 28s.

Everyone whose business is with the Elizabethan theatre must be grateful to Mr John Cranford Adams for *The Globe Playhouse*. It is a pattern of patient industry. No detail is too small for his attention, no difficulty does he scamp or shirk. Indeed, he will often most sportingly lay himself open to attack when he

¹ See, in addition to Douce 37 f. 1 and Sloane 2463, Brit. Mus. Add. 12195; Sloane 5; Bodleian MSS. 178, 483 and 591; Cambridge Univ. Lib.

MSS., Ee. 1. 13, II. vi. 33; Emm. Coll. 69; Jesus Coll. 43 and Trinity Coll. R. 14. 52.

² See my article in *Mod. Lang. Rev.* xxxix, 1-8.

need not, by pleading all sorts of trivialities, neither provable nor worth proving. An advocate should know when to leave his witnesses alone.

It would be but a poor compliment for a reviewer to pretend to agreement with Mr Adams on every issue raised; a sign, he might well suspect, either of little interest in the subject, or of a scamped reading of his book. Nor, within reasonable space, can a hundredth part of them be argued, so lavish of instances has he been. Let us take, then, a few of the most pertinent, those that may most affect the understanding or staging of our canon of Elizabethan plays; for here is the ultimate issue, after all.

To begin with, we surely now have, in the opening chapters Mr Adams gives to it, the bare construction of the Globe Theatre pretty accurately 'taped'. His elaborate deduction from the evidence of contracts and accounts, and his tests of these by sheer common sense, the cumulative persuasiveness of the whole, would do credit to Mr Freeman Wills Crofts's Inspector French—can one say more? He cumbers this part of his text, perhaps, with unnecessary detail, better fitted to footnotes; typically with all that he can find to say about 'Lords' and 'Gentlemen's', and 'Twopenny' and 'Twelvepenny' rooms, to end with the remark, with which he might as well have begun, that these '...are merely different names given at different periods or by different writers to the same thing'. Quite so; and much profitless argument would be spared us—this is no reproach to Mr Adams in particular—if we only bore in mind, over this and other such matters, that the Elizabethans were apt to be as inconsistent in their nomenclature as in their spelling.

Here and elsewhere, in comparing authorities, he treats the ever-cited 'Swan' sketch with refreshing scepticism. He does not, even so, seem to have the full courage to pit his common sense—which elsewhere serves him so well—against its obvious errors. It is time someone did; argument, print and paper have been wasted on them for long enough. Did any public theatre, once the inner stage, the 'study' (to take Mr Adams's term for it), had come into use, cripple and impoverish its scene resources with those two face-fronting, neighbouring doors, blank wall between? By no means. We ask where the maker of the sketch found them. In the memory of a play performed in some great hall. The end screen of that of the Inner Temple, for instance, will have offered two similar doors. As to the figures in the divided gallery above: to suppose them, ill placed both for seeing and hearing, to be privileged spectators is absurd. The seclusion of a *side* box may just about compensate for a *side* view, with acting probably employing something of the technique of the opera of to-day. But to have the actors with their backs to you, and removed by the whole depth of the stage, that would never do. Explanation? A confused memory, it might well be, of some play involving 'Presenters'.

Mr Adams makes a good case—a commonsense case—for most of the improvements and enlargements which, he holds, distinguished the Globe from the theatres preceding it. He may exaggerate the width of the new inner stage, his 'study'. Pretty certainly he sees it put to a more *exclusive* use than it is ever likely to have been. The question is not one of width or depth, or even, altogether, of lighting. (The present reviewer may on occasion have unduly stressed the poverty of this.) But it was from the outer stage, undoubtedly, that the actor could the better dominate his audience, that is the point; and he would be out upon it, as by instinct, whenever the business of the scene allowed. Important scenes were played on the 'apron', as the outer stage became, until Garrick's time or later. Nor had the actor to choose between inner and outer stage. He could cross and recross the boundary as he wished. In fact, once the curtains were drawn back, there was no boundary. And probably the usual practice was to let the action—anchored, so to say, to the necessary properties upon the inner stage—spread as

far as it would upon the outer. It could be hauled back at need. But sometimes there would be no need; and the curtains could close, and the scene be finished in the less confined space. Actors of the rhetorical school like a lot of elbow room. And if processions were involved, the outer stage would most certainly be used. Does Mr Adams really, as he suggests, see '*...Portia with Morrocho, and both their trainees*' entering on the inner stage, while those two imposing doors and some traversable yards of the outer were available for the processions? That Shylock and Antonio, supposed to be in Venice, had just gone off by them was, of course, of no consequence at all. He is inclined also, perhaps, to allow too much use to the upper stage, the 'chamber' as he names it. But in this he errs—if he does—in distinguished company. Dover Wilson has persuaded himself that important parts of the 'Ghost' scenes in *Hamlet* were played on the upper stage; and whither that rash conviction may lead him in his diagnosis of the action of other plays one shudders to think. Here it is chiefly a question of sight; yet not of mere sight. What could the groundlings, or even people in the lowest gallery, *effectively* see of scenes played three feet back or more behind that masking balustrade, and of seated figures particularly? Make them out, perhaps they could; but that is not enough. For scenes to be *effective*, especially if they are of emotional import, the actors of them must be able to dominate their audience. Juliet, leaning from her balcony, can do this. But Hamlet and the Ghost, or Cleopatra with the dying Antony—put them behind a Venetian shutter of a balustrade, and the actors might as well be acting in a cage. And taking sextant sights in inch scale models will be no test of this dominance. A theatre is needed, and actors, and an audience too. Well, as a reward for his book, Mr Adams certainly deserves that such a laboratory be set up for him. He could work out his problems in it and demonstrate them to the pilgrims that would flock there. And he would find in it the means of checking the development of many small errors.

For instance, he makes one assumption which, though perhaps generally correct, may yet be very misleading. He says that '*...it was the habit of Elizabethan dramatists to accept the equipment of their stage rather literally and to refer to that equipment in dialogue*'. No doubt they would when it suited them to do so. But if it didn't they wouldn't. 'Here, stand behind this bulk', says Iago to Roderigo; and we suppose, and probably rightly, that some piece of the stage's furnishing was as like to a real bulk as made no difference; and there is need for something of the sort. But it will be risky to argue from this that, in *Richard II*, Bolingbroke's '*...while here we march Upon the grassy carpet of this plain*' implies a stage strewn with rushes—especially since, a hundred lines or so later, it becomes the base court of the castle. Allusions of this sort are as likely to be made in terms of the fiction itself as of the stage on which it is being acted, and possibly likelier. To go no further than Shakespeare, we usually take it that the principal tavern scene in *Henry IV*, Part I, is meant to be played upon the inner stage because this seems to be the most convenient thing to do. For comings and goings the references are merely to a Nobleman or to the Watch being 'at door', or to letting them 'in'. But at the Boar's Head in Part II these are all to 'up' and 'down'. 'Ancient Pistol's below', and it is 'Call him up, drawer', and, later, 'Thrust him downstairs'—three or four times repeated, this. Are we therefore to conclude that the scene, 426 lines long, was played behind a balustrade upon the upper stage? Is it not likelier that the insistence on the up and down belongs to the fiction? Falstaff's carouse with Mistress Doll is a private one, and will suitably have place in some room upstairs, the Dolphin chamber or another. The audience would be sensible of this. The up and down, in fact, tends to show rather that the lower stage was used, and that therefore an upstairs room had to be specifically suggested in the dialogue.

There might well be a tendency—for a time at least—towards such 'realism'

as this enlargement and enrichment of the stage would accommodate. Some plays would demand it, others, then, be written to exploit it. The process is not unknown to later times. Mr Crummles, we remember, insisted on the introduction of 'a real pump and two washing tubs' into the play that his new recruit was to write for him. (Mr Adams surmises that, somewhat similarly, Jupiter's eagle from *Cymbeline* may have been borrowed for the *Golden Age* at the Red Bull.) But neither at the Globe nor at Blackfriars is it likely that the dramatist came to consider the stage structure as anything but a convenience to his play's action, to serve one turn at one moment, and another the next. He would avoid anomalies that brought unlikelyhood into his own convention. But this was pretty wide and pretty loose. Audiences were biddable enough in the matter of make-believe, remained so for long, remain so still. And most certainly the study, the balcony, the windows, the chamber and the staircase never acquired, so to speak, rights of their own. Not till nineteenth-century 'realism' came in was the scenery treated as an integral part of the play.

Mr Adams, then, is in continual danger—we all are—of being led astray by his own discoveries. He is tempted to build one conclusion on another, though the first is not firm. He shows that the designers of the Globe could widen their inner stage to twenty-three feet, at once concludes that they did, and sets something like a new stagecraft developing on that mere assumption. But there would be reasons enough—space needed for the drawn-back curtains for a simple one—for leaving a blank three or four feet on either side the opening. It is a minor matter, but consideration of it might have stopped him asserting so positively that all the 'Casket' scenes in *The Merchant of Venice* were played wholly upon the inner stage—and so, incidentally, providing himself with the quite imaginary problem of the whereabouts of extra curtains to conceal the caskets. He tells us that '... it is well established that Elizabethan actors spoke their lines at an average rate of twenty to the minute, a fact that...'. But is it a fact? And if it were, could any such average, drawn from an entire drama and the whole body of its actors, be of the least use for the study of a particular scene in a particular play, performed, as it will have been, by particular actors too?

One could go on picking such holes in his work. But that would be an ungrateful task, which would obscure, moreover, its real utility. For Mr Adams has set out to give us a detailed picture of the Globe Theatre and its mechanism, and has done so more comprehensively, we may suppose, than has ever been done before. And if the essentials are right, this alone should command our gratitude. With a tithe of his industry we can make the minor corrections ourselves.

HARLEY GRANVILLE-BARKER

NEW YORK

Dictionnaire des Instruments de Musique: Etude de Lexicologie. By ROWLAND WRIGHT. London: Battley Bros., Queensgate Press, and The Author, 'Wychwood', Collinsfield, Evesham, Worcs. 1943. xiv+192 pp. 21s.

Here is a very unexpected book—a book in the French language, by a British scholar, and published in Britain, and one covering a new field and covering it completely—a most painstakingly thorough piece of work which will be valued by (it is to be feared) a very small number of specialist readers, though, no doubt, highly valued by them. It presents 'the names, etymology, date of invention and description of all the instruments which figure in any French text from the earliest times to the end of the XIXth century', and one can readily accept its compiler's claim that 'the vast field of French musical literature has been thoroughly searched' and that it 'gives an exhaustive classification of every known instrument'. Indeed, the claim is too modest, since not only 'musical literature' has been searched but

unmusical also, including 'brevets d'invention' and voyages of discovery—the inclusion of the latter resulting in the addition of dozens or hundreds of names that have really nothing to do with France or the French language—Indian, Turkish, Abyssinian, Javanese, Japanese, and what-not? (Even names that belong to a European language other than French are included if they happen, on some one occasion, to have made a stray appearance anywhere on a French page; this latter instance of the author's conscientiousness, however, adds, in a way, to the usefulness of the book, since if in German literature one comes across mention of a *Himmelschen*, or a *Schellenbaum*, one can turn to this French book with a very good chance of clearing up the mystery as to its nature.)

Appended to the definition of every name is a dated and authenticated quotation of the passage in which it first appears—and sometimes this is followed by the quotation of several later passages also.

Going over the two hundred highly detailed pages with a small-tooth comb one could, of course, find opportunities here and there for vanity at what one believes to be one's superior knowledge. Mahillon is quoted as ascribing the *Inventionshorn* to Wögel 'vers 1780', whereas the term was used by Hampel in 1754. *Cor de basse* is hardly, as stated, derived from the Italian *Corno di bassetto*, both the French and the Italian names being, apparently, derived from the German *Bassethorn*. The derivation of the strange term *Cor anglais* is not yet so securely settled as the author implies, and even though the author explains to his satisfaction the adjective of the term he has still to explain the misleading substantive—the instrument not being, in fact, any sort of a horn. Then the *Cor de Kent* was not a 'trompette à clefs' (that latter term being correctly defined under its own head later in the book), but a keyed-bugle. And 'John Shere', as the name of the inventor of the tuning fork, should be 'John Shore' (d. 1752). Such disputable points as these, however, are of relatively small significance and one's dominant feeling on putting down the book is one of admiration of a model of diligent application. May the author be thus rewarded, as in any more material way he scarcely can!

PERCY A. SCHOLES

OXFORD

Reflexive Verbs: Latin, Old French, Modern French. By ANNA GRANVILLE HATCHER. (*Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages*, XLIII.) Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1942. 213 pp. \$1.25.

This work is a syntactical and stylistic study of the use of the reflexive construction, which is 'sampled' at three separate stages—Classical Latin, represented by Plautus, Cicero and Virgil; Old French of 'the interval between the *Eulalie* and Chrestien de Troyes'¹; and Modern French, represented by some dozen volumes of prose fiction ranging from Flaubert to Montherlant. The comparison of these three systems is intended 'to give, by superposition, a history *in potentia*'. It can hardly be said that this purpose has been achieved. In the first place, the texts examined are insufficient in number and variety to give a complete picture of the language of their times. Many of the author's general statements about the usage of, say, Old French, though doubtless true of her particular texts, have no validity for other texts of the same period; to quote only one example, we are told that in *Dresce, sire, en ta fuirur* (*Cambr. Ps.* vii, 6) 'the reflexive would have involved a command that God get to his feet!' (p. 105)—whereas reference to the early psalters, or even to the dictionaries, would have shown that *soi drecier* and

¹ It is not stated which of the O.Fr. texts listed on pp. 75f. were exhaustively studied; those most frequently cited are, besides the early

monuments, five *chansons de geste*, the *Eneas* and the *Lais* of Marie de France.

soi esdrecier were regularly used in just such contexts as this. What is still more serious, 'between Latin and Old French, between Old and Modern French, lie vast reaches of territory unexplored, unexplained' (p. 6). The inevitable consequence is that many of the historical explanations based on such limited data are inconsistent with the evidence furnished by Late Latin, Old Provençal (to say nothing of the other Romance languages), and French of other periods.

The material is, in general, analysed and classified with intelligence and insight, though artificial devices are sometimes employed to bring different cases under one heading: 'of both *sequor* and *morior* it is true... that the subject is entering into something greater than himself' (p. 16). Confusion of thought is revealed by the repeated assertion that there has nowhere been any 'weakening of reflexive force', even in cases like *s'effrayer*, and by *obiter dicta* such as "'border-line cases'" serve precisely to indicate the location of the border-line' (p. 30); and a similar confusion is responsible for several false analogies, as when, to corroborate the questionable explanation of *me refero* by *gradum refero*, a remark is quoted at second-hand from Lévy-Bruhl to the effect that the primitive mind identifies with the self not only the body but the shadow, the footprints, etc. (p. 69).

The author deserves credit for recognizing (doubtless under the inspiration of Leo Spitzer, to whom the book is dedicated) that 'poetry, laughter, fiction, as well as logic, analysis, and analogy, have proved to be creative factors in the development of the reflexive construction' (p. 9); but it is an exaggeration to treat of the language of twelfth-century France as if it existed solely for the purpose of recounting the exploits of epic heroes (pp. 125, 146, etc.). Miss Hatcher is aware of 'the danger of falling into a too "Vosslerian" animization of linguistics' (p. 8) and speaks slightly of one of Vossler's 'lyrical interpretations' (p. 124); yet she often rises to lyrical heights herself, and nothing could be more Vosslerian than the remark that the derivation of Rumanian *a se uita* 'look, contemplate' from *se oblitare* 'affords an interesting commentary on the dreamy, easily enraptured nature of this Eastern Romance people' (p. 82).

The fact is that Miss Hatcher is better endowed with imagination than with the technical equipment that was at least equally necessary for her task. She is insufficiently familiar with the principles and terminology of syntax in general;¹ statements by grammarians and philologists from Gilles du Guez to Brunot, Lerch and Foulet are misinterpreted or misrepresented; there are blunders in etymology, in Old French morphology, even in the meanings of Old and Modern French words.² It may be added that misprints, misquotations, wrong or missing references and similar slips are numerous; there are well over a hundred in the 72 pages of the Old French section alone.

The book will undoubtedly be of some service to future investigators as giving a complete analysis of the reflexive constructions to be found in certain texts, together with suggestions for several lines of enquiry; but the history of reflexive verbs in Latin and French remains to be written.

T. B. W. REID

MANCHESTER

¹ For instance, the expression 'hypothetical activity' is used with reference to constructions which have nothing hypothetical about them (pp. 86, 110, 112); the form *il est levez* (from *lever* intrans.) is described by the meaningless term 'compound present' (p. 129 etc.); the word 'dynamic' is repeatedly used without ascertainable significance.

² Thus *reposer* is derived from *reponere* (p. 91);

point (*Eneas* 3657) is ascribed to *poindre* (p. 77), and *eslissent* (*Willame* 335) to *eslaissier* (p. 109); *seoit*, *seioient* are given as forms of the present of *seoir* (p. 142); *cordoan* and *bresil* (*G. d'Angleterre* 2004) are apparently mistaken for place-names (p. 81); *se trouver* in 'l'amorce d'une petite branche qui s'était trouvée prise dans l'aubier' is rendered by 'to discover one's situation with a shock' (p. 178), etc.

Des Vers de France. A Short History of French Literature. By L. A. BISSON. Harmondsworth (Mx.): Penguin Books. 1943. 140 and 160 pp. 9d. each.

There is no lack of audacity in Mr Bisson's apology for the French aesthetic. He opens his ambiguously named anthology by quoting from Voltaire, 'De toutes les nations polies la nôtre est la moins poétique', and follows it up by the remark concerning ourselves that 'the suspiciously unanimous praise of French prose carries with it a low estimate, more often implied than expressed, of the quality of French poetry, of the imaginative and emotional depth of French literature'. There may be some to exclaim that Mr Bisson gives away half his case by admitting that the case of the opposition exists. They may call him to book, alleging that the reputation of French literature is not one to be questioned by civilized persons, that there is a chorus of praise for it throughout all Europe, that it is, as French scholars say, one of the *résultats acquis* of culture. All that may be so, but there is a problem, and Mr Bisson does well to face it with frankness. It is not so long ago that Swinburne's praise of Victor Hugo—

Thou art chief of us, and lord;
thy song is as a sword
keen-edged and scented in the blade from flowers;
thou art lord and king—

was scarcely less heretical than his song for Carrier of Nantes. Matthew Arnold pleaded the case of France; but a cause championed by Matthew Arnold is never more than half won. Saintsbury turned with immense gusto to the task, but his account was received with polite scepticism on the other side of the Channel, where the Englishman's claim to like what he likes was not admitted. Lytton Strachey, with a more elegant pen and a style poised between cynicism and dead earnest, was more fortunate; he carried with him at least the *cognoscenti*. We have since gone to school on a large scale with French professors, and the doctrines of Lanson, Mornet and others are current coin; but to what extent do they convince the heart? Assent from the brain is easy enough, it is even inevitable; but does the conscience go along with it? If it did, would there not be an inevitable impact of the English temperament upon the French material such as to create an opinion, valid as to substance, but marked by our own characteristics? Who will assert that such an opinion exists? But without it assent is barren.

It seems to us, therefore, that Mr Bisson has addressed himself to a large task, though the books are small enough to pass into any hand. It is well they should be small, since he must not allow prolix detail to obscure the essentials; they are not to be deemed the less important. Concerning French verse, Mr Bisson's case is that we have here 'a national habit, the characteristic utterance of a people disciplined in the art of words':

Where the English poet pours his emotion into the flood, the varying impulse of song, the French treads a more formal measure, keeps delicately to the mould within which he has chosen to work... More complex and sensuous, French poetry subtly transposes the original inspiration, the primal experience; there intervene the comment of the highest civilized mind, the polished art. The English poet feels and suggests, the French defines and describes, in the precise word and the exact image; he shows a view of the world reflected as in a mirror, the English reveals it as in a vision.

This is well and subtly said, but there may be some exaggeration in it both ways. Alexander Pope 'defines and describes'. It is true that he almost lost for a while the name of poet, but never that of Englishman. One may exaggerate the spontaneity of Shelley; he also was a master of the precise word precisely placed. On the other hand, we need no apprenticeship to some French verse: to Bernard de Ventadorn and Jofré Rudel, to the *chanson de toile*, the *rossignolet du bois fleuri*, *La Péronelle* and *La Pernelle*, Villon and Ronsard. There was already some distance

between us in the fourteenth century, when Englishmen declined the authorized leadership of Chaucer away from their native 'woodnotes wild', but the gulf surely opened at a particular moment in history, with *il gran rifiuto* of Malherbe. Malherbe stripped the language of its extravagance, and certainly fitted it for the precise business of prose; but as for verse—? The simpler, more precise vocabulary could be used with greater intensity; Racine is unequalled in that. Still, we have heard for the last time the accents of

Mignonne, allons voir si la rose,

and, without wearing a perruque, can we be glad to exchange this for

Ta douleur, du Périer, sera donc éternelle?

It is the singing note that seems to have become mute, until Hugo restored it in a strident tone.

Mr Bisson's choice of verses admirably exemplifies the distinctions made in his preface, and there can be no better quality in an anthology. Copyright difficulties have prevented the use of any poems by Hugo, who would have been difficult to fit quietly into this sequence, or by the Symbolists who advocated suggestion rather than definition.

The main problem facing anyone who would write a *Short History* is one of exclusion. There are many methods. One may make a microphotograph of a larger volume, as two former Editors of this *Review* did for Spanish and Italian respectively. The result, however, is usually a forest of names, dates, titles, in small capitals, italic type, brackets—*horresco referens*—and little space between for significant comment. Lytton Strachey followed the impressionistic way: he closed his eyes (we suppose) to all manuals and watched the forms and shadows as they came to his mind. They came with significance, at least for him. Mr Bisson has taken another short cut through the maze. He has excluded everything that does not come under the head of 'creative art', on the one hand, and he has found for all the rest—drama, novel, philosophy, poetry—a single view-point:

The characteristics of this literature have shown remarkably little variation from its beginnings to the present day. Prose and poetry, the drama and the novel reveal the same general features. The Frenchman sees life from an essentially realist and adult point of view, without illusion and without sentiment; this vision of life is the stuff of his literature, expressed in language neat, precise, lucid, economical. Demonstration rather than persuasion has always been the function of a literature based on observation rather than feeling.

So there are a number of names not present: Renan, Sainte-Beuve, Michelet, Guizot, Saint-Simon, Sévigné, Froissart, Joinville, *etc.* Theirs was not 'creative art'. But Boileau's *Art poétique* is here, though with a special comment to deny that it created any of the effects popularly supposed to flow from it. If the *Art poétique* or even *Le Lutrin* is creative in any sense, would not the meaning of the term stretch so far as to cover him who told the exquisite tale of Gaston Phoebus's devil? And if Froissart, why not Joinville? There is surely something fallacious, as well as unhistorical, in this conception of 'creative art' as restricted to those books which do no business. Prose was always full of business: to explain the wars of Greece and Asia, to delve into the causes of public disaster as a warning to statesmen, to denounce an aggressor or defend a client, to outline the basis of a sound education, to question received opinions. Remove from Greek literature Herodotus, Thucydides, Demosthenes, Xenophon, Socrates, and half the world's motives for good writing are lost. We, too, should have lost our best prose if the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were afflicted with the 'creative' heresy, which in our own day is used to exclude from 'literature' all those well-written books which happen to have important subject-matter. Prose became an art in order

to do those things which Mr Bisson's criterion seems to exclude: *seems* rather than *does*, since there is a fairly ample back-door into 'creative art' which accommodates Descartes and Boileau if not Bergson and Taine.

Still more debatable than these omissions are some of the generalizations—for instance, in much of the medieval section or in the discussion of Lamartine in terms of his first manner only; such expressions of purely personal opinion as some of the remarks about *Athalie*, and misleading simplifications like the statement that Alceste belongs to the 'great tradition of the *esprit gaulois*' or that 'once Corneille had found (in *Le Cid*) a formula that worked he stuck to it for the remainder of a long and successful career'. But there is a great saving of space through the entire absence of those irrelevant biographical trivialities which swell, to the dimensions of volumes, literary histories no more substantial than this one. The text is admirably clear and uniform, giving an abundance of room for those things which have to be said. The author has time to sketch mental backgrounds, briefly and with tact and knowledge. No doubt much is due to Lanson's example; but Mr Bisson's manner is his own; it is always personal, fresh, and gently and humorously surprising. He has the gift of condensing a plot, a philosophy or the programme of a school, into a few clear sentences. Particularly successful *résumés* sum up the thought of Rabelais and Montaigne, the doctrines of Boileau, Romantic drama, the *Comédie Humaine* and the style of Flaubert. These pages, and many others, should do the discerning reader a great service by giving him a lucid idea of French art and thought in a form happily free from the critical jargon that is so meaningless to all but specialists. For Mr Bisson is not writing for beginners, but for intelligent general readers and for such experts as can for a moment put off the professional mantle of cavillation. When you have read a French classic or spent a fortnight cosily with an author, and as you are turning the experience over in your memory, then see what Mr Bisson has to say. It will be said in a companionable spirit, undogmatically, but with ample knowledge and reflexion, and it will almost certainly begin a chain of new and attractive thoughts.

L. W. TANCOCK AND W. J. ENTWISTLE

LONDON AND OXFORD

Mithridate. By J. RACINE. Edited by G. RUDLER. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1943. xlv+107 pp. 6s.

Racine is, even for Frenchmen, what is called *un auteur difficile*; the true appreciation of a Racinian tragedy, as of a Mozart quartet, seems to require a special education. From this point of view, Professor Rudler's edition of *Mithridate* will be generally welcome, for it is not only a scholarly piece of work which will no doubt be acknowledged as the standard edition of the play, it is really an initiation into the art of Racine as a dramatist and as a poet, and a very helpful introduction to further study.

Besides providing the information one would naturally look for, such as a precise account of the sources and historical background, the elucidation of the text, a complete list of variants, the explanation of the numerous words and phrases the meaning of which has altered in the course of time, Professor Rudler, in his very full Introduction, has concentrated his attention on those points which are the initial stumbling-blocks for most English students: Racine's dramatic technique and his poetic diction.¹ English students, with Shakespeare and the Elizabethans fresh in their minds, look for 'development' of character and expect the author to follow his people through a series of experiences. But the French dramatist, unable to ignore the unescapable limitations of the stage, must focus

¹ Cf. J. Bailey, *The Claims of French Poetry* (Constable), where the traditional English objections are vividly stated.

the light upon ONE experience, one vital, dynamic conflict and the events leading up to it. Every Racinian tragedy is the story of a moral or emotional crisis.¹

It is therefore not surprising that one of the most valuable parts of Professor Rudler's Introduction—besides his masterly elucidation of the historical facts—should be his searching and exhaustive probing into the minds and souls of the characters; this is carried further in the Commentary, by constant reference to the text, almost line by line, until every moment of the successive waves of feeling has been clearly revealed, and the characters stand before us, as it were, sublimated, quintessentialized.

This psychological investigation has another instructive result: it brings to light Racine's dramatic construction. The play is built up entirely from within, by the workings of thoughts and motives, and not from without, by the weight of circumstance. The seemingly complicated mechanism of actions and reactions is taken to pieces before us, scene by scene, and put together again until it appears quite simple. We can see the wheels going round.

No less instructive is Professor Rudler's chapter on Racine's poetic diction. Most English readers, for whom English blank verse 'has the myriad lights and motions of the sea', are bored by the 'monotonous beat of the rhymed couplets', the alternating breaks after the sixth and twelfth syllables, which reminded Walter Savage Landor of 'the handle of the village pump'. Professor Rudler's Introduction should help to dispel such prejudices, or misunderstandings. He examines first Racine's vocabulary and style; the vocabulary is of the simplest, free from neologisms or any kind of verbal jugglery (though not entirely free from the contamination of *préciosité*; but this belonged to the intellectual atmosphere of Racine's day, as euphuism to that of Shakespeare's). But the simplicity of his language—*qui côtoie la prose*, said Sainte-Beuve—is only equalled by its extraordinary power of suggestion, by the intensity of the visions or emotions it calls up. It is the very essence of Racine's poetry to suggest a whole world of thought and beauty by the slenderest means. Turning to Racine's versification, Professor Rudler lays stress on its musical quality: a line of verse is part of a musical phrase divided into rhythmical groups, and the words of which these are composed have not only a sense but a sound value, a mysterious power of evocation, of suggesting shades of thought or feeling. Racine had a keen ear for the sonority of vowels, especially when lengthened by a mute (*ée, éle, ème, ie, ue*) for the quantity of syllables, the alliterative possibilities of consonants, particularly fricatives, sibilants and dentals. Never had the subtle witchery of the sounds of speech been made to yield such exquisite effects. These points are illustrated again and again in the Commentary (cf. p. 92).

Altogether, this is a stimulating, inspiring study, containing in a small compass all that is needed to help our university students to an intelligent appreciation of the greatest of French dramatists.

In Professor Rudler's concluding words, 'Racine est plus qu'un maître dramaturge, plus qu'un grand psychologue imaginaire, c'est un grand artiste, un grand poète.' And may we be allowed to end this brief notice by saying that all lovers of Racine will be grateful for this grand edition.²

H. E. BERTHON

OXFORD

¹ In his interesting study of Racine, Mr Lytton Strachey has shown that, at the present day, it is the Racinian, and not the Shakespearian, conception that has survived: 'The method of *Macbeth* has been, as it were, absorbed by that of the modern novel; the method of *Britannicus* still rules the stage' (*Books and Characters*, p. 8).

² We have refrained from discussing the familiar objection that the misfortunes of a Mithridate are of no interest to a modern reader. This

idea was expressed many years ago by Beaumarchais ('Quel véritable intérêt puis-je prendre à la mort d'un tyran du Péloponèse ou au sacrifice d'une jeune personne en Aulide?'). It would rule out *any* play based on a remote period of history. Serious students do not need to be reminded that Racine, like Shakespeare before him, was not concerned so much with the historical as with the *human* interest of his characters.

Jacques Cazotte (1719–1792). By EDWARD PEASE SHAW. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Humphry Milford. 1942. x+136 pp. \$1.50.

Until the appearance of this volume, there had been only brief, fragmentary or incidental studies in French, and in English merely a few scattered passing references, to Jacques Cazotte. Yet his works were translated into various languages—his best-known *Diable Amoureux* is not by any means the only one to have appeared in English—and his influence on later writers, French, German, and English (though one may not agree with Mr Shaw as to 'Monk' Lewis's indebtedness), also marks him as a figure, minor writer though he be, of considerable (albeit ephemeral) importance. But the works of Cazotte, though not without significance, are to-day of far less interest than his life, with its earlier labours and tribulations in Martinique, and its later comforts and dignity at Pierry, until the Revolution ended it, at the close of its seventy-third year, with a few tumultuous weeks and the guillotine.

Mr Shaw's work now brings together conveniently, from widely scattered partial monographs and studies, all the essential material, critical and historical, so far available on Cazotte's life and works; it attempts to estimate Cazotte's significance as a writer, and is at least more judicious in its appraisal than were some of the early critics; and it adds to the history of Cazotte's life its own very considerable special contributions from various MS. sources in the libraries and archives of France. The general organization of the volume into nineteen sections, varying in length from less than two and a half pages to well over a dozen, is not altogether happy: the vivid thread of Cazotte's life, which runs through from the first page to the conclusion, is too often lost to sight (to be later rather awkwardly picked up again) in the shadow of intrusive sections about general matters (the *Querelle des Bouffons*; the *genre* of the *conte*; Martinism; etc.) which should either have been fused more skilfully into the narrative, or else have been relegated to an appendix, summarized in a single short paragraph, or taken wholly for granted. Mr Shaw's literary style is exceedingly unpretentious, indeed not always quite adequate; and a number of passages, in the main of minor importance, are open to criticism on other grounds. It is inaccurate to say, for example, that Armida's beauty 'captured the bravest of the Christian warriors, including Godfrey' (p. 59); and she was not the 'daughter' but the *niece* of a magician. To state that 'Polite society was so greatly influenced by the vogue of the fairy that courtiers and their ladies, assuming mythological names, attended fêtes dressed as nymphs, satyrs, and gods' (p. 25) seems to confuse two separate traditions in the *merveilleux*. It is rash to accept at their face value descriptions of Cazotte's household at Pierry (as on p. 77) for which the only source is 'Anna-Marie': her *Famille Cazotte* is well known to contain its modicum—at least!—of fiction, and when it can be checked by other accounts it frequently appears unreliable. Again, if the interesting statement (p. 56, n. 207) that '*Le Lord Impromptu* was translated into English and, in 1800, retranslated into French as *Lisnor*...' is correct, the *Bibliography of Cazotte* (pp. 121–5) is defective: the only English version of *Le Lord*... which it records is that of 1928 (?).

There are, then, various points on which Mr Shaw's statements and his judgments do not seem entirely acceptable. But he tells us himself that his volume 'does not pretend to be an exhaustive critico-biographical study'; and in its modest way it performs a very useful function in calling attention to its strikingly vital subject. In the history of literature, Cazotte, though widely read in his day and not without influence on sundry later writers of several nations, has long since fallen into his place as inevitably second-rate. But his life, as a colonial administrator in the service of eighteenth-century France, as a provincial writer of *contes* in the popular types of the day, as a convinced and enthusiastic Martinist *illuminé*, and finally as a victim, dauntless to the last, of the Revolution's fanati-

cism and guillotine, has the double interest of being 'typical' by its participation in so many of the century's activities and movements, and at the same time exceptional, in the manner and degree of that participation. We may be very grateful for Mr Shaw's preliminary spade-work in laying the foundations, as he has, for an ultimate definitive study of a figure so exceedingly interesting, and so very little known, as Jacques Cazotte.

W. LL. BULLOCK

MANCHESTER

La Tradition Littéraire des Idéologues. By EMILE CAILLIET. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, Memoirs, vol. XIX. 1943. 322 pp. \$4.

The word 'ideology' has fallen on evil days. The dictionaries and histories of philosophy still assure us, indeed, that it means the science of ideas, but we all feel that it really applies to the congeries of muddled ideas associated with Fascism and Nazism. And we execrate the word and shriek in our nightmare of war, 'A plague on all ideologies'. Were it not that the academic world still maintains a healthy detachment from the transitory affairs of the political world, one might doubt whether Professor Cailliet had chosen the propitious moment to write a sympathetic book about ideology. But the name was bequeathed to him by a long and almost respectable tradition; and he is at considerable pains to demonstrate that the genuine article has no relation whatever with the *ersatz* abortion fathered by the Napoleons, Hitlers and Mussolinis of history. Condorcet himself, the recognized chief of the Ideological Group, was typical of it. Far from representing political romanticism, i.e. a false, emotionalized ideology founded on a fanatical belief in progress, and expressed by revolutionary, totalitarian and imperialistic passions, he was politically a moderate, destined to fall a victim to the Revolution, as were his followers to Napoleon.

But Professor Cailliet's principal preoccupation is less to restore ideology to the ranks of respectable philosophical systems than to establish its *droit de cité* in the literary tradition of France. He complains that hitherto, because of their scientific spirit, the *idéologues* have been regarded as the poor relations of French literature—mere hangers-on of the *philosophes* and *encyclopédistes*, a missing link between eighteenth-century rationalism and nineteenth-century positivism. He has little difficulty in persuading us of the literary claims of such leading *idéologues* as Condorcet, Cabanis and Destutt de Tracy—we were already more than half convinced—but we are indebted to him for his revelations about *La Décade philosophique, littéraire et politique*, the principal organ of the Ideological Group, and the *Mémoires* of the Moral and Political Sciences course at the Institut National (1798–1804). The importance of the salons of Mme Helvétius, Mme de Condorcet, and others is well brought out, and their role on the threshold of the nineteenth century is compared—with perhaps a little pardonable hyperbole—to that of the Hôtel de Rambouillet in the seventeenth century. Undoubtedly many notable works—e.g. of Helvétius and D'Holbach—are directly attributable to these salons. Such in the main is the literary corpus upon which M. Cailliet bases his claim that the *Idéologues* should be advanced to a place of honour in the French literary tradition; and it must be admitted that the case he makes out is good. Almost unnecessarily good, for in France, ever since technical subjects have been treated in the vernacular, scientific writers have shown as much respect for their mother tongue as the *littérateurs*.

For many, the most interesting aspect of the book will be the historical sketch of philosophical materialism with which M. Cailliet surrounds his main thesis. From Democritus to Zola, he parades before our somewhat undazzled eyes the long cortège of those brilliantly unenlightened spirits whom (in the Pascalian

'ideology') 'Dieu aveugle'. He shows a rationalistic and naturalistic stream of thought correcting and restraining, down the centuries, a Platonic metaphysics and an Aristotelian physics insufficiently ballasted with exact factual knowledge of the material world. In France, up to the end of the seventeenth century, the Aristotelian cosmology prevailed, but then tardily gave way before Baconian and Newtonian empiricism. Some of M. Cailliet's best pages are devoted to the extraordinary *volte face* that took place in French processes of thought between 1680 and 1715; when the theocentrism of the seventeenth century was gradually submerged by the anthropocentrism of the eighteenth. Taking the eighteenth-century attitude to Pascal, and in particular Condorcet's edition of the *Pensées*, as the touchstone, he shows how 'Condorcet juge Pascal de haut, en toute bonne foi et en toute certitude, avec le droit que lui donnent cent ans de progrès dans la culture de la raison.' *Certitude, certitude!* Here is an opportunity for some jesting Pilate. The truth is that Condorcet shared, with all the *philosophes*, *encyclopédistes* and *idéologues*, an unfortunately anti-Christian bias which is in no sense intrinsic to the rationalistic and naturalistic outlook, but which derives from the peculiar climate in which French rationalism developed.

To students of modern French literature, M. Cailliet's study of Ideology's legacy to Stendhal, and through Stendhal to Taine and the Naturalists, and so on to Barrès and Proust, will be particularly useful and illuminating. They will also be intrigued by Professor Chinard's proposal, in his most admirable introduction to the book, to reclassify modern French writers according as they adhere more or less closely to monistic or dualistic conceptions of man and reality. M. Cailliet is not blind to the limitations of an ideology founded upon pure sensation; while respecting the ideologues' own perspective as far as possible, he realizes it needs correction.

Alors que des conceptions strictes du déterminisme de l'âme humaine cadraient parfaitement avec la conception newtonienne de l'univers, et la reflétaient en quelque sorte au fond de nous, qui songe encore de nos jours, dans le monde des savants dignes de ce nom, à défendre un mécanisme pur et simple?... Le climat redevient favorable aux spéculations religieuses. Cependant la critique biblique cesse d'être l'apanage d'exégètes prétendant ignorer les données dont l'enquêteur pur et simple n'a nulle perception directe. (pp. 281-2.)

Thanks to these labours of the blind, the new metaphysics will be no less a science than physics; and biology, too, will have its psychological counterpart, no less scientific than itself, metabiology—the science of the complete creature. M. Cailliet notes that the new physics—especially radio-activity, relativity and the quantum theory—is restoring to favour the dualistic outlook on the universe. He might have added that the new psychology, through its exploration of the subconscious, bids fair to restore to intellectual currency the long-discredited concept of innate ideas.

M. Cailliet's book does not make easy reading, but he has done everything conceivable to attenuate its difficulty. He has provided it with an excellent index, very full summaries at the head of each chapter, a white, opaque page with plenty of body, and good-sized black type. There is also a bibliography almost terrifying in its scope and completeness. On the production side, apart from a fair crop of misprints, the book is a triumph, and will make a handsome, as well as a useful, addition to all self-respecting libraries.

F. T. H. FLETCHER

LIVERPOOL

Adventures of a Literary Historian. A Collection of His Writings Presented to H. Carrington Lancaster. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1942. xxxi+392 pp. \$5.

To celebrate Professor Carrington Lancaster's sixtieth birthday a number of his friends and former students decided to offer him a novel kind of *Festschrift*. Instead of the usual series of articles on subjects deemed to be interesting to the person honoured, they have compiled a selection of Lancaster's own writings which does him even greater honour and is perhaps more interesting to the world at large because of the glimpses it gives of the writer's attractive personality.

The matter, some of which has not been published before, is sorted into two parts. Part I, *Open to the Public*, ranges from presidential addresses and public lectures and stirring war-time radio appeals to articles of a 'college magazine' type and bits of humorous verse. Part II, *For Scholars Only*, reproduces articles in English and French varying in length from a few lines to many pages, and mostly in the field of seventeenth-century French drama which Professor Lancaster has made his own. But this division into popular and esoteric is not as rigid as it appears, for some of the addresses in the first part are rich in scholarship and literary experience, whilst the more specialized articles, even notes on bibliographical and philological points, show that blend of simplicity, unaffected erudition, modern outlook and dry humour familiar to readers of the monumental *History of French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century*. Thanks to his abounding common sense and skilful but judicious use of present-day analogies Lancaster can breathe life into the dry bones of almost forgotten polemics, textual emendations or small points of comparative literature. Moreover, he has two of the most valuable gifts of the critic: the open mind and freedom from that aggressiveness which thinks it a point of honour to ridicule those who hold other views. Even in articles intended to refute the findings of others, Lancaster goes out of his way to show that he considers his adversaries fellow-workers to be respected and persuaded rather than rivals to be crushed. Some use criticism for self-advertisement; Lancaster uses it to help others to understand and appreciate.

The book, which is admirably produced, also contains a biographical sketch by Louis Cons and a bibliography of Lancaster's writings down to 1941. It is not only a graceful tribute to a popular teacher who has devoted his life to research, but valuable to scholars and first-rate entertainment.

L. W. TANCOCK

LONDON

Vashington, ou La Liberté du Nouveau Monde. Tragédie en quatre actes par Billardon de Sauvigny. Edited by GILBERT CHINARD, with the assistance of H. M. BARNES, Jr., J.-J. DEMOREST, R. K. KELLENBERGER and E. E. SAROT. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press; London: H. Milford. 1941. xli+75 pp. 21s. 6d.

Billardon de Sauvigny eked out a slender literary talent by being all things to all men. A 'Philosophe' who contrived to keep on good terms with the Church, he sought the protection of ladies of the highest birth but was said to supply poems to the orders of Mme du Barry. He provided none too delicate libretti for the lavish entertainments given by the Comte d'Artois and was for many years mentor and literary advisor to Mme de Genlis. As a censor he took advantage of an absence of his colleague Suard to pass for publication a violent anonymous attack on Beaumarchais from his own pen. The Revolution found him fired with republican zeal and a commandant in the *cavalerie nationale*. In 1797, however, he thought it expedient to bring out a tragedy in honour of Bonaparte.

It is not surprising, then, to find this man, in 1791, astutely echoing the enthusiasm of all good patriots for Washington and the American revolution, and exploiting such analogies as could be found between the victorious struggle for freedom in the New World and the still uncertain struggle at home. As a work of art *Vashington* is so bad that it has the charm of a museum-piece. It flouts the rules of time and place, has a double action in order to bring in a 'Cornelian' heroine, the atmosphere is pseudo-Roman, the sentiments all the stock themes of the Physiocrats and Rousseau, the scenes placed usually in a camp or senate-house where massed soldiers, citizens and senators, grouped in attitudes of patriotic fervour, applaud emphatic harangues about liberty and tyranny. All this is clothed in a reach-me-down garment made up of snippets of Corneille, Voltaire and revolutionary oratory. The play was produced in July, and Professor Chinard generously ascribes its withdrawal after two performances to the civil disturbances in Paris following the return of the royal family after the flight to Varennes. This is the first time since then that *Vashington* has been brought out from oblivion.

In his well-documented introduction Professor Chinard makes no attempt to discover any literary merit in the play, though he is at some pains to throw on Sauvigny's time-serving career as flattering a light as possible. He points out, however, that the play is of considerable historical interest for Americans. It reflects the earliest phase of the Washington legend and portrays the American leader as the incarnation of all the civic virtues: strength, justice, clemency and incorruptibility. Sauvigny scarcely pretends to give a real picture of American conditions, but the birth of the U.S.A. is treated as part of the world-wide battle waged by the common man against privilege and exploitation, of which the French Revolution is another part. The historical inaccuracies of the play are in themselves suggestive, the council scenes, for example, being clearly modelled upon the procedure of the *Assemblée Constituante*. There is a strangely modern flavour about the role given to the English, who are alleged to use such devices as the breaking of treaties, satellite armies, maltreatment of prisoners and internal corruption by fifth-column work.

Like all Princeton books, this edition is sumptuously produced, and it contains some reproductions of interesting prints. One might have accepted the arbitrary spelling of the text with less hesitation had there been fewer misprints in the Introduction.

L. W. TANCOCK

LONDON

Petrarch and the Renaissance. By J. H. WHITFIELD. Oxford: Blackwell. 1943. 170 pp. 12s. 6d.

At the beginning of his *De Visione Dei*, Nicholas of Cusa mentions a self-portrait by Roger van der Weyden noticed by him in the Brussels town hall. What particularly struck him in this picture was that whatever the angle from which it was being viewed, it kept gazing on the onlooker. What Nicholas employed as an image to explain the relationship between universal and individual being, might equally well be taken to illustrate Petrarch's position towards Renaissance thought. For whatever be the manifestation of it we may be investigating, we cannot fail to detect some influence of Petrarch on it.

Is it possible to fix the beginnings of the Renaissance to Petrarch? This must remain a controversial point, depending very much also upon the definition of the Renaissance we are prepared to accept. Whatever the case may be, one thing is nevertheless undeniable: his great influence on this movement. Predecessors in the various spheres of the Petrarchan outlook and activities were, it is true, to be found in medieval times. John of Salisbury, Lovato de Lovati, and Albertino

Mussato anticipated to some extent his classicism; the philosophers of the school of Chartres his Platonism; Benzo d'Alessandria his conception of history. Petrarch's contemporary Cola di Rienzo was also interested in archaeology, and dared to dismiss the 'infallible' Aristotle as *garrulator*, thus arraying himself against traditional thought. And yet, in spite of all this, Petrarch's achievement stands quite unique in intellectual history.

It is this achievement and its influence on the Renaissance that form the field of the book under review. After examining and refuting some old-fashioned interpretations of the Renaissance, the author proceeds with a survey of Petrarch's thought and its significance. He considers his views on style and form, his political outlook, *etc.*, placing particular emphasis on his anxieties about the inculcation of virtue and the improvement of mankind. There is also a particularly competent analysis of Petrarch's classicism chiefly brought out by an examination of the *Africa*; while his concern with life itself is also subjected to scrutiny. The study of life was indeed in the author's view the mainspring of Petrarch's humanism. 'He turns to Plautus as to Cicero, not to escape from life into literature, but in order to pursue the examination of life.' Having dealt with Petrarch's intellectual outlook, Mr Whitfield switches over to later humanists. He surveys the relation between the thought of Petrarch and that of Coluccio Salutati, and Petrarchan influence on the principal fifteenth-century educationists. Particular stress is placed by him upon the practical side of Renaissance theories on education, and he rightly identifies the formation of citizenship as the goal of the new system. Dr Arnold's 'Christian gentleman' appears indeed remarkably close to the ideal of Vittorino da Feltre!

An entire chapter is dedicated to Valla, whose debt to Petrarch is pointed out. Even when Valla departed from Petrarch, remarks Mr Whitfield, 'it is a departure by suppression of the negative elements in Petrarch and a logical development of the positive ones'. The formidable figure of the expositor of the *Donatio Constantini* and his significance are well characterized.¹ Equally good is the essay on Leon Battista Alberti with which the book is concluded, and which shows *inter alia* how Alberti's 'logical progression from Petrarch represents the impact of humanism on the practical mind of the Florentine merchant class'.

Mr Whitfield's book has undoubted value as a contribution to Renaissance studies. Well written and well thought out, it combines clear reasoning with felicitous expression. Several excellent parallels, mostly drawn from Montaigne and Voltaire, help to bring out more sharply the salient features of the Petrarchan thought and moods, the significance of which is presented with clarity and understanding. Here is in fact a book which I would like to recommend not only to those interested in the subject, but also to anyone wishing to learn more about the history of ideas. To scholars it may perhaps prove in some ways disappointing. All the discussion on nineteenth-century views on the Renaissance might have been omitted with some advantage, as the theories in question had been already criticized and revised over and over again long ago. Moreover, several publications on the Renaissance of fundamental importance have been entirely ignored. There is no mention, for instance, of the extremely important studies by Konrad Burdach, Walther Goetz, and Ernst Cassirer, '*e degli altri mi taccio*'. Perhaps the line of demarcation between Middle Ages and Renaissance has been drawn too sharply. As a matter of fact, compromise between the two rival approaches to culture continued for long, this being occasionally obvious even in the activities of such typical humanists as Poggio, Pomponio Leto, or Valla. A word of criticism should also be uttered in connexion with some of the texts used. The masterly and definitive

¹ For the Renaissance attitude towards Epicurus which is examined in connection with Valla see now also D. Cameron Allen, 'The Re-

habilitation of Epicurus and his Theory of Pleasure in the Early Renaissance,' *Studies in Philology*, xli (1944), 1-15.

editions of the *Famigliari* by Vittorio Rossi and the *Africa* by Nicola Festa are passed over in favour of older and less satisfactory ones. According to the bibliography the text of Cicero used was printed in 1534, while Rossi's *il Quattrocento* is referred to in the first edition of 1898, and not in the revised and up-to-date issue of 1933.¹

Finally, there are also some minor points I feel obliged to query. Space compels me, however, only to deal with very few here. The view of the Papacy during the later Middle Ages (p. 15) might have been acceptable half a century ago, but must be considerably revised now in the light of twentieth-century research on papal history and administration. Did Dante really damn the sin of curiosity in Ulysses (p. 33)? I very much doubt it. Petrarch was not the discoverer of Quintilian's *Institutes* (p. 109). Part of this treatise was known during the Middle Ages; as for the complete work, this was only brought to light independently by Poggio and Nicholas of Clemanges after Petrarch's death. Again, Valla can hardly have been one of the first to hold a chair of rhetoric and eloquence as it is stated (p. 121), since the teaching of these subjects was very much developed in medieval universities, where it formed an important part of the arts curriculum.

Despite the above strictures, I would like to end with a note of praise for Mr Whitfield's generally valuable book. Particularly since it seems to me that he has succeeded in delineating that elusive spirit of the Renaissance which was so happily characterized in the advice in Cennino Cennini's *Libro dell' arte*: '*attendi, che la più perfetta guida che possa avere e migliore direzione, si è la trionfal via del ritrarre dei naturali*'.

R. WEISS

LONDON

Orthography, Phonology and Word Study of the 'Leal Conselheiro'. By KIMBERLEY S. ROBERTS. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania. 1943. viii + 58 pp.

Morphology and Syntax of the 'Leal Conselheiro'. By HAROLD J. RUSSO. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania. 1943. xi + 72 pp.

In these two dissertations we have excellent studies of a fascinating subject of the greatest importance—the *Leal Conselheiro* written by King Edward of Portugal in the first half of the fifteenth century, of which there only exists one manuscript at the Bibliothèque Nationale.

The work of Mr Roberts needs but little revision in order (a) to correct a few spelling and accentuation errors in Modern Portuguese; (b) to regularize his method in giving the equivalent; (c) to give 'fermento' and 'côvedo', 'côvado' for 'fermento' and 'couodo' in preference to 'grão', 'semente' and 'cúbito'; (d) in cases like 'côpeço' to maintain the form 'compeço' wrongly substituted by Roquette for 'começo'²; (e) to supplement the meaning of cases like 'falicimento' and 'manhas' by adding 'êrro' and 'qualidades'. I cannot agree with Mr Roberts when he says that 'suydade' is probably a misspelling of 'sujidade', for King Edward made it very clear that it is 'saüdade'. This is, by the way, one of the most interesting points in the work.

For Mr Russo, King Edward 'is a purist', and because of that he sees faulty agreement in the verb in sentences like '... cadahuu denos husamos'. Cases such as this³ and '... as cousas tenho scriptas'⁴ merely show Latin influence on the Portuguese didactic prose of the period. Sometimes King Edward goes so far as to wish to bring the Portuguese sentence within Latin syntax.⁴

¹ I seize this opportunity to draw attention to a recent work on Petrarch of fundamental importance, C. Calcaterra, *Nella selva del Petrarca* (Bologna, 1942).

² See *Leal Conselheiro*, ed. org. by J. M. Piel.

³ See (a) *Chrestomatia Archaica*, (b) *Digressões Lexicológicas*, by J. J. Nunes.

⁴ See *Lições de Literatura Portuguesa. Época Medieval*, by M. R. Lapa.

In '...tu homem sem saber aquello que semeas nom sera uiuificado' and '...muytos mancebos fara' there is no faulty agreement in the verb. In the first case, the sentence should be read with commas after 'tu' and 'saber' (Insipiens, tu quod seminas...). In the second case, the subject of 'fara' is 'que' referred to 'tanto'.

After making these brief suggestions with the sole intention of showing the great interest of these two treatises the reviewer would like, as a Portuguese, to thank Mr Russo and Mr Roberts for their valuable studies of a most important work of a great Portuguese king for so long not easily accessible to scholars.

J. B. SABINO COSTA

LIVERPOOL

The Road to Hel. By HILDA RODERICK ELLIS. Cambridge: University Press. 1943. viii+208 pp. 12s. 6d.

The name suggests a more limited study than in fact appears in this book, but is justified inasmuch as the purpose is to establish for Scandinavia pre-Christian belief in a realm of the dead and a journey to it. To that end archaeological and literary evidence is examined in chapters I and II, and the conclusion reached leads naturally to the subjects of the succeeding chapters, conceptions of a future life, the cult of the dead, the soul, necromancy and the journey itself.

The archaeological evidence gives good grounds for assumption of survival in some sense; the idea of a journey based on ship-burial is much more doubtful. Admittedly Scandinavian practice in disposal of the dead was very complex. Cremation had lasted a thousand years before the introduction of Christianity and continued afterwards, and it is not credible that the associated beliefs were the same in the later as in the earlier period. This book, however, is concerned with the heathen centuries before the introduction of Christianity. Just then the burial customs, and inferentially beliefs, had been profoundly modified by contact with Roman civilization. Miss Ellis does not inquire what amongst these was general Teutonic and what specifically Scandinavian, which is unfortunate, for it touches the problem closely. The Scandinavian countries were remote, and we should expect and we find, abundantly illustrated, survivals of barbarous practices and beliefs, e.g. a persistent tradition of human sacrifice, traces of suttee, fertility cults with sacrifice of kings to ensure fertility, marriage with the god, sympathetic magic, shape-changing, and in general an animistic stage in religion. The attempt to reconcile these with higher beliefs is idle. The high gods came late to Scandinavia, are restricted locally, and as it seems, socially, and it looks as if we had an overlay on an animism which persisted and left its marks on the gods themselves. The real beliefs are related to the grave-mound and its occupants, the external soul, elves, *landvættir*, dying into the hills, ancestor worship, practices like the death meal and other rites affecting the dead. All these are adequately set forth and documented in this study.

Archaeology gives us facts, but the grave furniture has no voice except what we give it; cult too, modified it may be by passage of time, gives us facts; but explanations of either in literary records can claim validity only for the period of the record, or at best a little earlier. The belief that the soul of the dead was carried off to Odin in the flame and smoke of the funeral pyre is interesting, but valid only for the late date at which we find it, and no more illuminating for early beliefs than the absurd explanation of *naglfar*, 'the ship of the dead', in Snorri's *Edda*, based on a false etymology. It is unfortunate that the literary evidence is so late and so predominantly Icelandic. Heathen or not, it dates from a time when external contacts were intimate and important. One consequence is that these Scandinavian accounts cannot profitably be discussed in isolation. The author is

alive to this (in places), but in practice ignores it. The value of the work accordingly lies in the collection of references in Scandinavian literature bearing on the subject, and it is fair to add that the author is modest in the statement of her aims and conclusions and does not claim to do more than sift the available evidence there, 'to clear the ground' and see if 'any consistent body of pre-Christian ideas about life after death' may emerge. It is convenient to have it so collected even if most is well known, and it would have been still more convenient if more fully indexed so that references to particular rites, beliefs and the like could be found immediately.

One criticism is unavoidable. The author is entitled to employ the later Icelandic, instead of the normalized, spelling—Njörðr, Ragnarökr, Fóstbræðra—and to print names in the nominative—Hrappr, Freyr—but she should have been consistent. Why then Olaf Páir or Balder? In these and other Norse forms irritating errors occur in considerable numbers, due (as it seems) to carelessness in correction of the proofs. Typical examples, all on p. 86, are *Níðhoggr*, *úndirdjúp* (correctly on p. 175), Gimli. The names of Odin's wolves were Geri and Freki, not Gera, Freka (p. 68), and while it is permissible to write Ragnarökr, it must not be rendered 'the doom of the gods' which (in her spelling) is Ragnarök. Finally, there are numerous forms where the necessary accent is omitted, e.g. Noatun (p. 45), Þorhallr (p. 117), and especially in the index, Þrainn, *Vafþrúðnismál*, and in the citation of sagas, *Havarðs*, *Hjalmðers*, *Ljosvetninga*, *Óláfs*, *Þorðar*, *Víga-Glums*. Other words in the index show that these are not deliberate.

R. GIRVAN

GLASGOW

SHORT NOTICES

Behind the issue of a further volume of *Work in Progress* (*Work in Progress* 1942 in the *Modern Humanities*, Bulletin No. 20 A. Modern Humanities Research Association. May, 1942. xiv + 314 pp.) there is a record of real enthusiasm, organizing ability, and industry, on the part of its editor, Dr James M. Osborn and his co-editor, Miss Patricia Withner. Nothing could give stronger evidence of the value of this publication, which we have owed to Dr Osborn since 1939, than its continued appearance during the crisis of a world war, and nothing could be more striking than the volume of 'Work' still 'in Progress' despite concentration of national resources upon the war effort. It is true, as Dr Osborn remarks in his preface, that *Work in Progress* 1942 deals almost exclusively with work in North America, for good reason. But even so, the record is impressive and all-embracing. And there is evidence of the practicality of the record in the preliminary 'Report on Work completed or discontinued since 1939' (pp. vii-xiv). It is grievous to consider how large will be the field of 'Work discontinued' by young scholars whose life has been abruptly turned into other channels, many never to return.

It is to be hoped that in due course the section on Slavonic Studies will be greatly enlarged by direct contact with the active and fruitful work going on in Russian universities, not least in the field of linguistic studies.

I have noted only one misprint. On p. iv, for 'Edert' read 'Eilert'.

C. J. SISSON

LONDON

The promoters of an artificial language based upon living English will not be able to ignore G. M. Young's brief pamphlet on *Basic* (S.P.E. Tract, LXII. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1943. 14 pp. 1s. 6d.), which is a masterpiece of critical exposition, holding its reader's attention from beginning to end. With urbanity and wit,

with ease and precision, the author proceeds from the general to the particular, from the formulation of the problem to the marshalling of the evidence, and from the weighing of the evidence to the statement of the verdict. That verdict is unfavourable. Basic is 'bad speech' (p. 44). No mention is made of the laudable motives prompting some men of good will to support it, and very little is said about the extravagant claims made for it by its advertisers. Having been so delightfully entertained for half an hour, the reader of this paper is in a position to assess the validity of those claims for himself. There is one interesting point of linguistic theory on which we do not find ourselves in complete agreement with the author. Is it 'generally admitted' (p. 35) that 'the advance of the noun at the expense of the verb is a sign of linguistic decay'? Are growth and decay in language really demonstrable? Languages *change* with the needs of those who speak them. In Vedic Sanskrit, Greek and Old Church Slavonic, as compared with modern English, substantival forms preponderated. Were those languages less advanced on that account? Is present-day English *in every respect* more advanced than that Indo-European from which it has sprung? In his main assertion the author is justified. From Indo-European to Primitive Germanic, and yet more from Germanic to English, verbal forms have continued to develop at the expense of the substantival (noun-pronoun-adjective-participle), so that now the verb and the verbal phrase are truly 'the mainstays of our tongue' (p. 41) which, 'with their extraordinary range of syntactical manipulation, are the centre and strength of the language' (p. 43). Towards the close of his long life Robert Bridges became more and more obsessed with the problem of a universal language. It is therefore fitting that this essay should now appear in the publications of that Society of which he was the founder.

SIMEON POTTER

SOUTHAMPTON

The twenty-eighth volume of *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association* (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1943. 83 pp. 7s. 6d.) has been collected by Dr R. W. Chapman, and in every way maintains the reputation of the series. Mr N. R. Ker opens with a paper on 'Aldred the Scribe', arguing that he was Aldred the Provost and that he wrote both the gloss to the Durham Ritual and that to the Lindisfarne Gospels, the differences noted by Skeat being due to Aldred's attempt to make his script worthy of the nobler manuscript. Mr J. A. Chapman writes of Shakespeare's Sonnets as 'Marching Song'—poetry known by heart and repeated while tramping the country roads so that one lives close to it and measures it against the life one sees. Mr E. M. W. Tillyard discusses 'The Action of Comus', showing how the additions in the 1637 version reveal a change in Milton's intention and settle the debate between Comus and the Lady. Dr L. F. Powell adds to the canon of Dr Johnson's writings the Preface to the first *Index to the Gentleman's Magazine*, which he reprints. In 'Harmonious Jones' Mr R. M. Hewitt 'rescues' Sir William Jones from the philologists by recalling his fame as a translator of Eastern poetry and showing how he 'altered our whole conception of the Eastern world'. Dr F. Page contributes an interpretation of *Balder Dead*, urging the probability that Arnold 'had at least the fortunes and the future of Christianity in his mind when he wrote'. A sympathetic study of 'The Love Poetry of Thomas Hardy' by Mr V. H. Collins completes the volume.

WINIFRED HUSBANDS

LONDON

It is a pity that a young scholar on the look-out for a 'research problem' should be directed, apparently on account of the mere availability of a somewhat rare book, into a field as ungrateful as that treated in G. D. Hocking's *A study of the*

Tragoediae Sacrae of *Father Caussin*, 1583-1651 (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press; London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press. 1943. 74 pp. \$1.25. English price not stated). It is perhaps an even greater pity that the study, once performed as a training exercise, should swell the list of books to whose making there is no end, rather than enshrine its few really valuable findings in a brief and useful article.

The chapter on Caussin's life has a little new material; that on the school theatre adds nothing to work done already by such writers as Gofflot and Boysse. The analyses of the plays themselves and of their structure conscientiously reveal nothing more attractive or important than a pious and enthusiastic Jesuit professor writing rhetorical Latin tragedies for his pupils: plays of moral rather than dramatic preoccupation, lacking action, characterization, in a word, sense of 'theatre', ignoring or neglecting the unities (not in itself necessarily a bad thing) and violating the *bienséances* in horrific manner. The study of sources and of later plays which are identical with or similar to Caussin's is superficial and adds nothing of importance to what was already recorded elsewhere.

From the bibliography one misses Loukowitch's *Evolution de la tragédie religieuse classique en France* and (*à propos* of the German's translation of the *Felicitas*) F. W. Wentzlaff-Eggebert's *Dichtung und Sprache des jungen Gryphius* (Berlin, de Gruyter, 1936). There are a few misprints (e.g. p. 12, n. 6: *Ægyptiorum*), while inconsistent notation (e.g. p. 24: II Kings 25; p. 27: II Kings xxv) may be misleading.

I can honestly recommend this volume, in which one neither finds nor ought perhaps to expect unusual profundity or unusual breadth of treatment, only to the most ardent students of the obscure *minutiae* of the religious school theatre of the seventeenth century.

H. W. LAWTON

SOUTHAMPTON

As compact, pleasant and easy to handle as previous volumes in this series (and not least the *Manon Lescaut* which the late Miss Mysie Robertson saw happily launched shortly before her death), Mr F. A. Taylor's edition of Voltaire's *Lettres Philosophiques* (Oxford: Blackwell. 1943. xxxii + 184 pp. 8s.) has qualities of its own. At a time when there is a natural fresh demand for handy editions of Voltaire's writings, this volume should be appreciated by the general public as well as the student. It is scholarly; it is lucid; above all, it is practical.

Full acknowledgement is made in the Introduction to the 'indispensable work of Voltaire scholarship' performed by the late Gustave Lanson, and Mr Taylor follows Lanson in accepting Jore's as the authentic text, but his edition 'has no interest in perpetuating as Lanson does Jore's chaotic spelling' and further corrects a number of misprints, while indicating in the Variants every departure from Jore's text. This accomplishment alone would render the *Lettres* more accessible to the reader than in Lanson, encumbered as that masterly edition must inevitably appear to the non-specialist by the wealth of collated detail which Mr Taylor has simplified by scrupulous selection.

The Introduction also meets objections occasionally raised by those English students (all too few) in seminars who are sufficiently well-acquainted with the institutions of their own country to question Voltaire's interpretation of them. Similarly in his Notes Mr Taylor bears clearly in mind the advantages or limitations of the English reader, as for example when he carefully explains Cartesian principles (Letter xiv), but takes the short cut to explaining Letter xvi by a comprehensive reference to Pemberton. And how refreshing to find a note like this (Letter xviii): 'Voltaire's argument, if I understand it, is as follows....' *Oh, si sic omnes!*

There are a few omissions. Even in a 'Select' Bibliography one would hope to find mention of the edition by Raymond Naves which superseded that of Labroue, or of the bibliographical study by A. Lantoine, quotations from which might have enlivened Mr Taylor's account of the publication and condemnation of the *Lettres*. But this is a matter of personal taste. The edition is admirable.

H. TEMPLE PATTERSON

LEICESTER

The first English translation of *Guðmundar Saga* (*The Life of Gudmund the Good, Bishop of Holar*. Translated from the original Icelandic sources by G. Turville-Petre and E. S. Olszewska. The Viking Society for Northern Research. 1942. xxviii+114 pp. 6s.) is complete except for the omission of 'certain annalistic and genealogical sections and passages not essential to the main theme'. The places of the omissions are unfortunately not noted by asterisks or any other such device. The translation itself is plain and straightforward, and is preceded by a useful Preface on the history of Christianity in Iceland up to the time of Bishop Gudmund, and by Introductory Notes on Gudmund himself, the great Icelandic families, and the three Lives of Gudmund.

EDITH C. BATHO

LONDON

Mr H. George Frank's book, *Holland Afloat* (London: Netherlands Publishing Company. 2nd edition, 1943. 176 pp. 10s. 6d.), was written as a tribute to the Royal Dutch Navy. The author has tried to do two things—to tell the story of Holland's Navy in the present war, and, as a background, to sketch in Holland's great maritime past. He succeeds admirably in his first aim, but in his second he adopts a kinematic technique which is hardly successful. We are whirled about from century to century and cannot help complaining that our dizziness could have been avoided if the author had constructed his book on more humdrum but at any rate more logical lines. The author's subject is exciting enough to provoke interest without resort to tricks, and he usually shows himself able to tell a good story well. There are some errors and some doubtful judgments. 'Wolsey's campaign against the Plymouth Brethren' (p. 145) is a curious slip, and few would agree that William III was Louis XIV's 'greatest and most dangerous and most successful enemy'. But in a book of this kind such faults are pardonable, and the author may well plead in extenuation the value of his account of the work done by Dutch sailors of the present. The book is well-produced, and there are excellent illustrations.

S. H. F. JOHNSTON

ABERYSTWYTH

NEW PUBLICATIONS

January—March 1944

(Date of Scandinavian and Swiss publications, unless otherwise stated, 1943)

With the collaboration of PAMELA GRADON (English), R. J. McCLEAN
and C. BAIER (German and Scandinavian)

GENERAL

- BODMER, F., *The Loom of Language: A Guide to Foreign Languages for the Home-Student*. London, Allen and Unwin. 15s.
- BRADY, C., *The Legends of Ermanaric*. California and Cambridge Univ. Presses. 18s.
- BRØNDAL, V., *Præpositionernes Theori. Indledning til en rationel Betydningslære*. Copenhagen, Munksgaard. 1941. Kr. 6.
- JESPERSEN, O., *Efficiency in Linguistic Change*. Copenhagen, Munksgaard. 1941. Kr. 4.50.
- PEDERSEN, H., *Tocharisch vom Gesichtspunkt der indo-europäischen Sprachvergleichung*. Copenhagen, Munksgaard. 1942. Kr. 17.
- PIKE, K., *Phonetics—A critical Analysis of Phonetic Theory and a Technic for the Practical Description of Sounds*. Michigan and Oxford Univ. Presses.
- RAST, J., *Drama und Spielfilm—eine Studie*. (Diss. Freiburg, Schweiz.) Olten, Walter. 1942. Swiss fr. 6.20.
- Sache, *Ort und Wort—(Festschrift) Jakob Jud zum 60. Geburtstag, 12. Januar 1942 (=Romanica Helvetica, series linguistica vol. 20)*. Geneva (Droz) and Zürich (Rentsch). Swiss fr. 60.
- Schweizerische Sprachforschung, hrsg. von der Schweiz. Landesbibliothek, mit Beiträgen der Professoren K. Jaberg, H. Baumgartner, R. Hotzenköcherle und Dr A. Schorta und einem bibliographischen Katalog. Bern, Lang. Swiss fr. 6.
- SHOEMAKER, F., *Aesthetic Experience and the Humanities: Modern Ideas of Aesthetic Experience in the Reading of World Literature*. Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 17s. 6d.
- SIMMONS, E. J., *An Outline of Modern Russian Literature (1880–1940)*. Cornell and Oxford Univ. Presses. 6s.
- SINGER, S., *Die Sprichwörter des Mittelalters. Bd. I. (Von den Anfängen bis ins 12. Jahrhundert.)* Bern, Lang. Swiss fr. 12.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES

General.

- MAISSEN, A., *Werkzeuge und Arbeitsmethoden des Holzhandwerks in romanisch Bünden. Die sachlichen Grundlagen einer Berufssprache. (=Romanica Helvetica, series linguistica vol. 17.)* Geneva (Droz) and Zürich (Rentsch). Swiss fr. 32.
- SCHUEERMEIER, P., *Bauernwerk in Italien, der italienischen und rätoromanischen Schweiz. Eine sprach- und sachkundliche Darstellung landwirtschaftl. Arbeiten und Geräte*. Zürich, Rentsch. Swiss fr. 48.

Italian.

- KRISTELLER, P. O., *The Philosophy of Marsilio Ficino*, trans. into English by V. Conant. Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 30s.

Spanish.

- CASALDUERO, J., *Vida y Obra de Galdós, 1843–1920*. Buenos Aires: Losada. \$2.00.
- Handbook of Latin American Studies, 1941*, ed. by M. Burgin. Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 22s. 6d.

Portuguese.

- DA CUNHA, E., *Rebellion in the Backlands*, trans. from 'Os Sertões' by S. Putnam. Chicago and Cambridge Univ. Presses. 30s.
- STEN, H., *Les particularités de la langue portugaise*. Copenhagen, Munksgaard. Kr. 9.

French.

- BENEIT, *La Vie de Thomas Becket*, ed. by B. Schlyter (*Études Romanes de Lund*, iv). Lund, Gleerup; Copenhagen, Munksgaard. 1941. 8 Sw. kr.
- CAILLET, E., *The Clue to Pascal*. Philadelphia, Westminster Press. \$2.00.
- CLAUDEL, P., *L'Annonce faite à Marie*, ed. by A. L. Sells and C. M. Girdlestone. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 5s.
- (Feuillerat.) *Essays in Honor of Albert Feuillerat*, ed. by H. Peyre. Yale and Oxford Univ. Presses. 16s. 6d.
- LECONTE DE LISLE, *Poèmes choisis*, ed. by E. Egli. Manchester, Univ. Press. 5s. 6d.
- RACINE, J., *Mithridate*, ed. by G. Rudler. Oxford, Blackwell. 6s.
- RACINE, J., *Phèdre*, ed. by R. C. Knight. Manchester, Univ. Press. 3s. 6d.
- SHAW, E. P., *Jacques Cazotte (1719-1792)*. Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. \$1.50.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES

Scandinavian.*(a) General (including linguistic)*

- BERGSVEINSSON, S., *Grundfragen der isländischen Satzphonetik*. Copenhagen, Munksgaard, 1942. Kr. 15.
- DIDERICHSEN, P., *Sætningsbygningen i skaanske Lov*. Copenhagen, Munksgaard, 1941. Kr. 12.
- JACOBSEN, L. and E. MOLTKE, *Danmarks Runeindskrifter, I*. Copenhagen, Munksgaard, 1941. Kr. 100.
- WESTERGÅRD-NIELSEN, C., *Låneordene i det 16. århundredes trykte islandske litteratur*. (*Bibliotheca Arnemagnæana*, vol. III.) Copenhagen, Munksgaard. Kr. 20.

(b) Danish

- ALBECK, U., *Stil og Teknik i Blichers Noveller*. Copenhagen, Munksgaard, 1942. Kr. 10.
- Anderseniana, Bd. IX og X. H. C. Andersens Brevveksling med Henriette Hanck. Ved S. Larsen. Copenhagen, 1941-2. Kr. 15.
- BURNETT, CONSTANCE B., *The Shoemaker's Son: The Life of Hans Christian Andersen*. London, Harrap. 10s. 6d.
- NØRVIG, J., *St. Blicher. Hans Liv og Værker*. Copenhagen, Munksgaard. Kr. 12.
- RUBOW, P. V., *Reflexioner over dansk og fremmed Litteratur*. Copenhagen, Munksgaard, 1942. Kr. 7.

(c) Norwegian

- BERGSGÅRD, A., *Aasmund Vinje. Norsk nasjonal konservatisme*. Oslo, Aschehoug, 1940. Kr. 15.68.
- BULL, F., *Verdenslitteraturhistorie*. Oslo, Gyldendal, 1941. Kr. 9.
- EITREM, S., *Ibsen og Grimstad*. Oslo, Aschehoug, 1940. Kr. 7.84.
- HYDLE, H., *På Bjørnsons veier*. Oslo, Fabritius, 1941. Kr. 2.52.
- LEA, D., *Hans E. Kinck. Grunnmotiver i hans diktning*. Oslo, 1941. Kr. 13.44.

(d) Swedish

- BØRGE, V., *Strindbergs mystiske Teater*. Copenhagen, Munksgaard, 1942. Kr. 18.

English.

(a) *General (including linguistic)*

CROSS, T. P., *Bibliographical Guide to English Studies* (8th ed. revised). Chicago and Cambridge Univ. Presses. \$1.00.

Essays by Divers Hands, xx, ed. by G. Bottomley. London, Oxford Univ. Press. 8s. 6d.

GRIERSON, H., *The English Bible* (Britain in Pictures Series). London, Collins. 4s. 6d.

KRUISINGA, E., *The Phonetic Structure of English Words*. 1943. Bern, Francke. Swiss fr. 5.80.

LÖFVENBERG, M. T., *Studies on Middle English Local Surnames*. Copenhagen, Munksgaard. 1942. Kr. 12.

YOUNG, G. M., *Basic* (S.P.E. Tract, No. LXII). Oxford, Clarendon Press; London, H. Milford. 1s. 6d.

(b) *Old and Middle English*

ATKINS, J. W. H., *English Literary Criticism. The Medieval Phase*. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 12s. 6d.

BØGHOLM, N., *The Layamon Texts*. Copenhagen, Munksgaard. 1943. Kr. 8.

HUGHES, M. J., *Women Healers in Mediaeval Life and Literature*. New York, King's Crown Press. \$2.00.

(c) *Modern English*

BONJOUR, A., Coleridge's 'Hymn before Sunrise'. [Diss.] Lausanne, Imprimerie La Concorde.

KAZIN, A., *On Native Grounds. An Interpretation of Modern American Prose Literature*. London, Cape. 21s.

KOENIG, E. G., *John Ruskin und die Schweiz* (Schweizer Anglistische Arbeiten, 14). Bern, Francke. 1943. Swiss fr. 9.

LEVIN, H., *James Joyce. A Critical Introduction*. London, Faber and Faber. 8s. 6d.

STOLL, E. E., *From Shakespeare to Joyce*. New York, Doubleday, Doran. \$3.50.

WALPOLE, H., *The History of the Modern Taste in Gardening*, ed. by I. W. V. Chase with an Estimate of Walpole's Contribution to Landscape Architecture. Princeton and Oxford Univ. Presses. 23s. 6d.

WORDSWORTH, W., *Poems founded on the Affections; Poems on the Naming of Places; Poems of the Fancy; Poems of the Imagination*, ed. by E. de Selincourt. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 25s.

YULE, G. U., *The Statistical Study of Literary Vocabulary*. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 25s.

German.

(a) *General (including linguistic)*

Handwörterbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens. Hrsg. unter besonderer Mitwirkung von E. Hoffmann-Krayer und Mitarbeit zahlreicher Fachgenossen von Hanns Bächtold-Stäubli. Bd. 10: Register. Berlin, W. de Gruyter. 1942. Subscr. M. 23.50.

STEIGER, A., *Sprachliche Modetorheiten*. Bern, Haupt. Swiss fr. 2.50.

(b) *Middle High German*

HARTMANN VON AUE: *Der Arme Heinrich mit der Übersetzung von Wilhelm Grimm*. Hrsg. von Friedrich Ranke. Basel, Schwabe. Swiss fr. 3.25.

HINTSCHE, E., *Ein deutscher anatomischer Text aus dem 15. Jahrhundert: (= Berner Beiträge zur Gesch. der Medizin und der Naturwissenschaften, No. 2)*. Bern, Haupt. Swiss fr. 2.40.

Mystische Texte aus dem Mittelalter. Hrsg. von Walter Muschg. Basel, Schwabe. Swiss fr. 4.

(c) *Early New High German*

SCHNEIDER, CHARLES, Luther poète et musicien et les Enchiridien de 1524. Geneva, Henn. 1942. Swiss fr. 9.

(d) *Modern German*

BÄNZIGER, H., Gottfried Keller und Jeremias Gotthelf. Versuch einer Gegenüberstellung. (Diss. Zürich.) Bern and Leipzig, Haupt. Swiss fr. 5.50.

BEREND, E., Jean Paul und die Schweiz. Frauenfeld, Huber. Swiss fr. 4.

BROCK, E., Ernst Jünger und die Problematik der Gegenwart. Basel, Schwabe. Swiss fr. 2.

BURCKHARDT, C. J., Erinnerungen an Hoffmannsthal und Briefe des Dichters. Basel, Schwabe. Swiss fr. 3.25.

GOETHE, J. W. von, Faust. Der Tragödie zweiter Teil. Ed. by H. G. Fiedler. Oxford, Blackwell. 12s. 6d.

GÜNTHER, W., Weltinnenraum. Die Dichtung Rainer Maria Rilkes. Bern and Leipzig, Haupt. Swiss fr. 12.

HEBBEL, F., Herodes und Mariamne. Ed. by Edna Purdie. Oxford, Blackwell. 7s. 6d.

HELBLING, C., Adalbert Stifter. Aufsätze. St. Gallen, Tschudy. Swiss fr. 6.

MICHEL, W., Hölderlins Wiederkunft. Zürich (Scientia) and Vienna (Gallus). Swiss fr. 10.50.

MOMBERT, Dr. Alfred Mombert, geboren den 6. Februar 1872 in Karlsruhe, gestorben den 8. April 1942 in Winterthur. (In memoriam.) Winterthur, 1943. Swiss fr. 1.50.

NILS, MARIA, Betsy Meyer, die Schwester Conrad Ferdinand Meyers. (Lebensgeschichte, Tagebücher und Briefe.) Frauenfeld and Leipzig, Huber. Swiss fr. 9.50.

Rilke et la France. Textes et poèmes inédits de Rainer Maria Rilke. Essais et souvenirs de Edmond Jaloux, Paul Valéry etc. Paris, Plon. 1942. fr. 33.

STAIGER, E., Meisterwerke deutscher Sprache aus dem 19. Jh. (Aufsätze). Zürich and Berlin, Atlantis. Swiss fr. 8.80.

VONTOBEL, W., Von Brockes bis Herder. Studien über die Lehrdichter des 18. Jahrhunderts. (Diss. Bern.) Bern, Grunau. 1942. Swiss fr. 10.

WEHRLI, M., Das geistige Zürich im 18. Jahrhundert. Texte und Dokumente von Gotthard Heidegger bis Heinrich Pestalozzi. Zürich, Atlantis. Swiss fr. 9.60.

MODERN HUMANITIES RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 SEPTEMBER 1943

(Transactions in England only. No remittance or information received from America during the period under review)

Dr. 1942	EXPENDITURE	1942		INCOME		Cr.
		£	£ s. d.	£	£ s. d.	
22	To Printing, Stationery, Postages, Travel- ling Expenses, etc. ...	24	13 8	By Subscriptions		
52	Do. (American Expenses) ...	24	13 8	General ...	92	10 0
69	Secretarial Assistance and Audit Fee ...	83	13 6	American Members ...	92	10 0
1	Do. (American Expenses) ...	83	13 6			
	Bibliography			" Bibliography		
	Binding and distribution. Vols. I- XIX (no publication 1943) ...			Sales (vols. I-XIX) ...	27	12 8
6	" Year's Work in Modern Language Studies		9 19 2	" Year's Work in Modern Language Studies		
	Distribution, etc. (vols. I-X) (no publication 1943) ...		2 16 1	Sales (vols. I-X) ...	13	2 9
2	" Modern Language Review		184 16 5	" Lettres de La Fayette		
	Deficit per Account attached			Sales ...	14	0
145	" Surplus for year carried to Balance Sheet ...			Bulletins and Indexes		
				Sales ...	1	2
				Interest on Bank Deposit ...	5	4 7
				" Work in Progress ...	2	5 0
				" Modern Language Review		
				Surplus per Account attached ...	164	8 8
				Deficit for year carried to Balance Sheet		
			£305 18 10		£305	18 10
			£297			

This Deficit on the *Modern Language Review* is due to an alteration in the date at which the accounts were drawn up, and to the absence of information from America. EDITOR.

BALANCE SHEET 30 SEPTEMBER 1943

AUDITOR'S CERTIFICATE AND REPORT

(Signed) L. SCRIVENER
Incorporated Accountant.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE
7 March 1944

EDITORIAL NOTICE

The General Editor gives notice that from 1 October 1944 his address will be, as before the war,

University College, London,
Gower Street,
London, W.C. 1.

Editorial communications, and all books for review, should be sent to this address.

PRIMER-VERSIONS OF LITURGICAL PRAYERS

'How real a creation, how *sui generis* is the style of the Prayer Book.' Though made by one no less than Cardinal Newman, this statement was bound to evoke severe if not always objective criticism. In his brilliant essays on *Characters of the Reformation*,¹ Hilaire Belloc greatly restricted Catholic appreciation of Cranmer's genius when calling the English liturgy 'a wonderful document so far as artistry is concerned', obviously implying that the liturgy would be more praiseworthy had there been less artistry. 'Presumably', so Mr Belloc continues, 'most of the Collects, the translation of the Prefaces of the Mass incorporated into the English service, and many other Catholic prayers similarly incorporated', are Cranmer's work. Mr Belloc apparently did not endeavour to discover which Collects were actually 'incorporated', which newly composed by Cranmer (in fact, he seems to believe that Cranmer hardly translated any Catholic Collects), and he left it open what are the 'many other Catholic prayers similarly incorporated'. Did he mean certain traces of Catholic prayers found in the occasional liturgical functions, such as the Churching of Women, the Visitation of the Sick, the Solemnization of Matrimony, Ordination and Baptism?

Mr Belloc's opinion was expressed as early as 1823 by the great J. K. L., Dr Doyle, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, when writing in his *Vindication of the Religion and Civil Principles of the Irish Catholics*:² 'We Catholics prize the Anglican liturgy as only less perfect than that from which it has been principally extracted.' Was it a sign of a closer investigation into the right of Belloc's 'presumably' and Dr Doyle's 'principally' when, in more recent years, Mr Hutton³ wrote: 'As literature, the Common Prayer Book is very largely a translation by men altogether of Catholic culture and upbringing of parts of the Roman Breviary, of its Psalms and Canticles, Responsories and Prayers'?

Whilst up to Palmer's *Origines Liturgicae* (1832) all commentators of the Common Prayer Book had assumed that the liturgy of the Church of England had originated entirely from the Reformation, the Ritualist Movement rediscovered and studied the Pre-Reformation liturgy. Summing up the results of their studies, Dr Blunt stated: 'A glance at the Common Prayer Book makes it apparent that the new book was, substantially, as it still remains, a condensed reproduction, in English, of those Service-books which had been used by the Church of England for many centuries before the Reformation.'⁴

However, whilst Dr Blunt is mainly concerned with the dogmatical aspect (a little further on he calls the Book of Common Prayer an 'expurgated English version' of medieval liturgical books), Mr Belloc deliberately confines himself to the appreciation of literary 'artistry'. Dr Blunt's notes, however exhaustive they may seem, are deceptive. They show indeed how much the Prayer Book owes to the Sarum service-books (they do not show how far it still agrees with the present-day Roman liturgical books), but not how much has been omitted. A comparison

¹ London, 1936, p. 126.

² Dublin, 1823, p. 29. This is the only passage of this book to be marked in pencil by an old hand in the copy preserved in Trinity College, Dublin.

³ *Catholicism and English Literature*, London, 1942, p. 58.

⁴ *The Annotated Prayer Book*, London, 1872, p. 18; 1903, p. 16.

between a complete medieval Breviary and Missal with the main part of the Prayer Book, however, makes it evident how right Newman was, how few traces of 'Catholic culture and upbringing' have been left by the expurgators. Even the literary value of the Common Prayer Book cannot be justly appreciated unless the whole extent of Pre-Reformation vernacular versions of liturgical texts¹ is taken into consideration.

This study has, so far, been carried out mainly with a view to establish the tradition of the Common Prayer Book and, therefrom, its right of claiming to be the true representative of a national religious tradition. The first edition of Maskell's *Monumenta* appeared four years before his reception into the Catholic Church.² In the introduction to the first scholarly collation of twelve Primers (1892), Littlehales said: 'The addition of the Latin words would not have served any useful purpose.' Though only referring to the Latin-English Primer (Glasgow MS. v. 8, 15), this remark has a more general significance. The study of the Primers has suffered from the lack of reference to the Latin original, just as English study of the liturgy in general has frequently suffered from unwillingness to trace and acknowledge Roman relations. Owing to this two-fold restriction, we are still deprived of a comparative study, firstly, of the Sarum and the Roman uses, secondly, of the whole of the Sarum use and the vernacular selections made therefrom, mainly in the Primers, and, thirdly, of the whole extent of the vernacular liturgical texts found in the Primers and the Common Prayer Book.

Whilst the interest of students of the history of English language and literature is naturally confined to the latter two points, it should be noticed that their full significance can be appreciated only in conjunction with the first, indeed fundamental, point. Even the purely philological study of the Primer-versions of liturgical texts is bound to fail unless they are appreciated in their relation to the whole tradition of Catholic liturgy. From this point of view we should gain first of all the basic distinction to be made in liturgical studies—a distinction for obvious reasons mostly overlooked—between texts merely selected (mainly from the Bible and the Fathers) and adapted for liturgical use, and texts originally composed for liturgical use, mainly Collects and Prefaces. When we consider the extensive literature on the first group of texts, we realize that the study of the latter group of texts is still in its infancy.³

From the philological point of view both groups of texts are, as translations, of special value for ascertaining the exact sense of a certain word or phrase. Vernacular versions of texts specially composed for liturgical use, however, are of additional interest as they are extremely rare, and always have been much rarer, and are based on a much shorter tradition, than translations of Biblical texts. Littlehales's 'collation of Manuscripts' has obscured the fact that in the few Primers which are still preserved we have to distinguish at least three or four versions. A comparison of the translations of one prayer published by Littlehales from MS. Dd 11, 82 of

¹ A survey of the literature concerning the pre-sixteenth-century Primers is found in Dr J. E. Wells's *Manual of the Writings in Middle English*, New Haven, 1916-23, and the *Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*, Cambridge, 1940, i, 186 ff.

² See the article on Maskell in the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

³ Mr Day's study (E.E.T.S. clv, 1917) is significantly enough devoted to the lessons of one part of the Primers. This is, so far as I know,

the only study hitherto published on a special problem of the Primers. After acknowledging the value of the liturgy, Dr Doyle (see p. 325, n. 2) continues: 'we acknowledge the translation of the Bible with all its imperfections.' Miss Deanesly (*The Lollard Bible*, Cambridge, 1920, p. 328) discusses the Primers only in order to throw a side-light on the history of the English Bible. Mr Hutton's remark on the liturgy (see p. 325, n. 3) is followed by six pages on the value of the English Bible.

Cambridge University Library and MS. G 24 of St John's College, Cambridge, will make this quite clear:

C.U.:

Almighti endeles god that art worchinge with the holi gost wondurfulli *thou madist redi*¹ the bodi and the soule of the moost blessid modir and maide marie to disserue to be maad a worthi wonyng for thi sone, graunte that we be delyuerid bi hir meke preier of yuelis that we han now, and of sudeyn deeth and endeles....

S.J.:

Almighti everlastynge god that wonderly thurgh the holi goost madyst redy bodi and soule of the glorious virgyn and moder marie that she disservede to be maad the worthidwellynge place for thi sone, graunte thurgh whose mynde we ben maad glad that we be delyuered bi hir piteuous instawnce fro yuelis that now be and fro endless deeth and sodeyn....

It suffices to add that only three of the Primer manuscripts have so far been published, two of them in a scholarly way.

In the Bibliography of the *N.E.D.* no reference is made to the Pre-Reformation Primer-versions, except for Maskell's work, and if Primer-versions are referred to, this is merely done with regard to Biblical texts. For such important points as the superseding of the word 'belief' by the word 'faith', however (*N.E.D.* i, 782), a better illustration could hardly be found than a comparison of the versions given for the Collect for Trinity Sunday (one of the few post-Gregorian Collects preserved in the Book of Common Prayer) in the MSS. CU and SJ (as above), the former having 'that selue bileue', the latter 'the same feith'. Though this paper will be confined to the pre-sixteenth-century Primers, I may add that the Primer of 1535 has 'of this faith', from which the Prayer Book version 'in this faith' is obviously derived. This is, incidentally, an instance where it may be seen that the dating of the Primer manuscripts from merely paleographical evidence should be supplemented by a dating from their linguistic evidence. According to Littlehales MS. SJ ('feith') is before 1400, whilst CU ('bileue') is 1430 or later.²

Another distinction of fundamental significance for the study of Pre-Reformation vernacular versions of liturgical texts is that between living and petrified liturgies. By living liturgies we should understand liturgies still showing the characteristic of life, namely, growth and development. In contrast to the medieval Western and modern Roman liturgies, the Eastern and the modern Protestant liturgies no longer grow. True to the principle from which they originated, the Reformed liturgies undergo changes, if any, only in the sense of further 'expurgation

¹ For these words MS. 17010 Brit. Mus. has 'greythedeest'. This prayer still underlies the Collect for the feast of the Immaculate Conception, a feast which at a very early date was celebrated in England.

² Similar examples are the use of the word *aghenbier* or *agenbyghere* for *redemptor* in the translation of the Gregorian prayer *Fidelium Deus* (now the Collect for the first Mass of All Souls' Day) at the end of Compline, for which the Primers offer a great variety of versions, or the use of the word *hestis* for *mandata* in the Collect for Peace (see below) in MS. CU. More examples of the increasing replacement of Saxon words are found in the enlarged prayer in honour of the Blessed Virgin which I quoted above: *blesid—glorious, maide—virgyn, preier—instawnce*, a little noticed aspect of the problem of 'Basic English'. The words of Norman origin relating to the religious sphere ('charity'!) tend to become untransparent and 'petrified'.

An equally important aspect of the vernacular versions of liturgical prayers is the translation of words and phrases added by the liturgy to the theological vocabulary derived from the Bible, for instance, words taken from the military and legal language of ancient Rome, similes expressive of the Celto-Teutonic sense of nature which strongly influenced the Gallican liturgy of the early Middle Ages (which in turn acted upon the Sarum use and the English liturgy), and finally ideas derived from the moral application of Biblical texts under the influence of the social system of the later Middle Ages (see below the comparison between the Primer and the 1549 version of the prayer in honour of St John Baptist). This additional vocabulary in Latin and also in the vernaculars is, to this day, responsible for certain misunderstandings between Catholics and Protestants.

and condensation'. Temporary additions, such as the liturgical forms for State Services¹ and—in Ireland especially—the modern prayers for certain emergencies, cannot be compared with the essential and constant increase of liturgical texts and even ceremonies found in the modern Roman liturgy, not to speak of the dazzling variety of liturgical life during the Middle Ages of which the Preface to the Prayer Book of 1549 complains so bitterly.

Far from being really distinctive of or even opposed to Rome, the numerous liturgical functions and texts proper to the (Latin) Sarum use must rather be appreciated as signs of the freedom and growth characteristic of the Western liturgies.² When speaking of the necessity of visualizing the Primer prayers on the background of the Catholic tradition, I meant this tradition past and present. It is a little-known fact that during the last hundred years the Catholic Church in Great Britain has developed a liturgical calendar prescribing more than a hundred and sixty feasts proper to the various dioceses of Scotland, England and Wales with texts partly taken from the ancient writers of English Church history, partly from the Sarum books, partly from foreign sources and partly newly composed, an impressive though practically unexplored line of English literary tradition. The Marquess of Bute's attempt to reproduce this tradition in the vernacular³ has not yet been followed up. Yet if, as the increasing interest of the laity in the liturgy would suggest, this work should be undertaken, the study of the Primers would certainly attain a practical significance.

A comparison between the Primers and the official books of the Sarum use shows that there are even certain features proper to the former. At the end of Compline, for instance, the Primer MSS. Brit. Mus. 17010 and 17011 and Bodleian Ashmolean 1288 have the following prayer not found in the Sarum books:

Almyghti god everlastinge whiche bi the goodly gretynge of Gabriel and the hooli natiuyte of crist thi sone and his gloryous resurreccion and the wondyrful assencion of him and the worshipful assumpeion of marie glorious modir of god thou broughtest ioy to the same virgyn, graunte for her love that we be deluyered from all spices of sorwe, and to use perfyghtly euerlastynge ioyes.

Unlike all the other Collects, this prayer (which seems to be related to the final prayer of the Angelus) has not a Latin headline. It is obviously an enlargement of the ancient Collect *Concede nos*, now used for the Common of the Blessed Virgin and the Votive-Masses on Saturday (except during Advent), which MS. CU renders as follows:

Graunte us thi seruantis, lord god, we preien thee, that we moun be ioieful euermore in heelthe of soule & of bodi, and thorour the biseching of the glorious, euerlastynge maide marie, we moun be deluyered of this sorewe that we han now, & vse fullliche the ioie withouten ende.

Whilst the largest body of Catholic Collects preserved in the Book of Common Prayer are those for the Sundays in Lent, after Easter and after Pentecost (all of which are Gregorian), many of the very features distinctive of the Sarum use were unsuitable for the Reformed liturgy. Indeed, the development of liturgical devotion

¹ See my article 'Gleanings from the liturgy of the Established Church, I. The form of prayer "Against the Irish Rebels"', in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, October, 1944.

² 'Religion in England had enriched the Church with the Sarum use, akin to other uses elsewhere.' Whitney, 'Reformation Literature in England', *Cambridge History of English Literature*, III, 28.

³ *The Roman Breviary*, London, 1908. The translation of the Offices peculiar to Ireland is prefaced by the remark: 'The translator did not live to revise this translation.' He was also unable to translate the numerous Offices restored to his native country in 1898, or the later Offices granted to Great Britain.

in the later Middle Ages of which these distinctive features are mainly expressive was the type of religious literature most abhorred by the Reformers. Most of the prayers found in the Primers were still less suitable. Four-fifths of the Primers consist of what is now known as the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary and of the Office of the Dead, devotions which, like the cult of the Blessed Sacrament (Exposition and Processions), were developed in connexion with and even by the mediæval guild system. The Little Office, to this day the daily Office of the more cultured part of the laity,¹ is expressive of the increasing devotion to the Mother of God, of which also the above-mentioned enlargements made in some Primers of the Collect *Concede nos* is an example; these enlargements are concerned with a meditation on the mysteries of Mary's life (as is the Rosary)² and, more particularly, they are an early document of the devotion to the (seven) Joys of Mary.

In 1542 (Wilkins, III, 863), Henry VIII had directed the expurgation of all liturgical books 'from superstitious orations and collects, and from memories of all saints not mentioned in the Scripture or authentical doctors.' Some Primers (Brit. Mus. 17010 and 17011 and Ashmolean 1288) give for the Lauds versions of the Collects for several Saints' days, namely, Michael, John the Baptist, Peter and Paul, Andrew, Lawrence, Nicholas, Margaret (the martyr, 20 July) and Catherine (of Alexandria), an interesting selection showing—in a remarkably weird temporal order—which were the most popular Saints in England in the later Middle Ages. Of these feasts the Church of England retained only the second, third (now called St Peter's) and fourth, and for all three, as indeed for all other feasts of Saints, new Collects were prescribed in 1549. Here are, for example, the Primer and the 1549 Collect for St John the Baptist's day:

Primer:

Lord, defende us thorough the perpetual bisechyngis of seint Ion baptyst in how myche we been more free,³ in so myche more bere thou us up with necessary helpes....

Prayer Book:

Almighty God, by whose providence thy servant John Baptist was wonderfully born, and sent to prepare the way of thy Son our Saviour, by preaching us repentance; Make us to follow his doctrine and holy life, that we may truly repent according to his preaching; and after his example constantly speak the truth, boldly rebuke vice, and patiently suffer for the truth's sake....

The Primer Collect is a translation of one of the finest specimens of a Roman Collect dating from the still 'uncorrupted' period of Christian antiquity. So far as I am aware, the literary qualities of the prayers of the Book of Common Prayer have never been discussed from the point of view of the traditional rules laid down (and, in the Roman liturgy, in the twentieth century revived) for the composition of Collects. What a contrast between the austere parallelism of the *quanto-tanto* of the Roman Collect which the Primer-version so faithfully renders, and the Prayer Book Collect which shows the characteristics of eleventh-century Gallican prayers, due especially to the moral application of a Bible story! What a decay of structural sense from the Collect for the fifth Sunday after Trinity (where the Prayer Book follows the ancient Roman liturgy) to the Prayer for the High Court

¹ The Little Office has also been said every day by the Cistercians (who probably introduced it into England) in addition to the ordinary Office, and is recited by the majority of the female congregations who do not say the full Office. Thus the popularity of these texts is, to this day, very great indeed.

² For the 'Five Joys of Mary' see Ch. Brown's Index to his *Register of Middle English religious and didactic verse* (Oxford, 1916), p. 422.

³ This used to be the second Collect for the feast of the Beheading of St John, 29 August: *Gelasian Sacramentary*, Wilson, p. 196.

of Parliament, not to speak of still more 'baroque' prayers, as for example, in the State Service against the Irish Rebels (see note 1, p. 328)!

Thus, only in very few instances are we able to draw a direct comparison between the Primers and the Prayer Book. I have shown elsewhere what interesting conclusions may be drawn from such occasional comparisons. In the Collect of the Votive Mass for Peace (which, at present, is added in practically all Masses said in any part of the world) the words *hostium sublatâ formidine*, usually translated 'after being freed from the fear of our enemies', may, so I suggested, also be translated 'after the superiority of our enemies has been endured'. The Collect for Peace as prescribed by the Prayer Book to be said in every Evening Prayer reconciles these two versions (of which the latter no longer implies the idea of prayer for victory) saying: 'being defended from the fear of our enemies.' All the Primers in which we can trace this prayer, however, translate 'that the drede (or feare) of enemyes be putt awei' or 'taken from us', or, as the Primer of Henry VIII of 1545 still puts it, 'taken away'.

In some editions of the Book of Common Prayer the Collect for Peace is called 'Prayer for Inward Peace', whilst the Post-communion of the Votive Mass for Peace which is said in the Morning Prayer is called 'Prayer for Outward Peace'. The Collects for Peace are the only Collects distinctive for Morning and Evening Prayer; in the Primer of Henry VIII only that now prescribed for Evening Prayer was used, and there it was assigned to Matins. The new arrangement and the striking change in the translation was due to Cranmer. Dr Blunt suggested that the idea was that, 'following up the tone of the *Nunc Dimittis*', the Collect for Inward Peace should form 'a sweet cadence of prayer, fitly concluding with the subsequent Collect "Lighten our darkness", ringing a gentle echo of the peace that lies beyond this world', an interpretation *ex post* which is not in keeping with the origin nor the traditional use of these prayers.

Modern Catholic translations of the (Evening) Collect for Peace, which I traced from 1828 onwards, show a variety which can only be attributed to a rather naïve neglect of the tradition. At this point I may perhaps add that the study of the Primer-versions of liturgical prayers is the only means of attaining to greater uniformity, correctness and 'artistry' in modern Catholic translations of liturgical prayers, a subject worthy of the attention of linguists, with a view to the laity's increasing interest in the liturgy (especially in America). The production of an English Missal and Breviary (of the latter the earliest specimen dates from about 1763) is indeed a task which should be just as attractive as the ever new attempts to revise Chaloner's Bible. The importance of this task may be judged from the fact that a few millions of English-speaking Catholics read every morning or at least every Sunday ten or twelve pages out of their vernacular Missal. It is characteristic indeed that, in the extensive discussions on the use of the vernacular in the Catholic liturgy recently carried on in the Catholic press of England, the tradition of Pre-Reformation vernacular versions of liturgical prayers was completely ignored.¹

¹ I may quote, at this point, the description of the English liturgy given in Taine's *Notes sur l'Angleterre* (1860/61; Paris, 1895, p. 13): 'Le livre de messe de l'Angleterre. Beaucoup de souffle et un certain grandiose hébraïque dans le goût de Milton; pas de tendresses, d'épanchements comme dans l'Imitation; pas de fleurs de rhétorique ni de douceurs sentimentales comme dans nos petits livres dévots, mais un ton imposant, passionné, parfois lyrique: la liturgie a été rédigée au temps

de la Renaissance et en garde l'accent. Chose remarquable, ici la date et l'origine de chaque morceau sont indiquées en note; celui-ci est du sixième siècle; cette prière est tirée des apocryphes, mais on l'a conservée à cause de son élévation. Par ces remarques, le fidèle est instruit, renseigné sur la critique et sur l'histoire.... Avec le temps, ceci doit conduire à l'exégèse allemande.' Taine apparently never came across a French translation of the Roman Missal.

The principal reason for the neglect of and the misunderstandings in the study of the Primers is certainly found in the faithfulness with which the Statute at Large of 1549 was executed prescribing that all liturgical books in Latin or English previous to the new Prayer Book should be 'extinguished, burnt or destroyed'. The Primer published by Littlehales in 1891 escaped destruction only in virtue of its binding being lettered on the back 'Common Prayer'. In 1895 Littlehales published the text of the Primer CU in the Original Series of the Early English Text Society, thus for the first time drawing the attention of philologists to this untapped source of our knowledge of late Middle English religious literature.

Littlehales said that 'the Primers form a valuable link in the chain of evidence respecting the religious knowledge and piety of our medieval forefathers', a careful restriction of Maskell's statement: 'The Primers show that there was never a period in the history of English literature, where care was not taken to enforce upon all priests the duty of teaching the people the rudiments of the faith in the vulgar tongue, and to provide books fitted for that purpose.' The earliest mention made of a Primer is found in 1297, and the earliest manuscript preserved dates from 1380. We have no evidence that the issuing of Primers was encouraged by the ecclesiastical authorities. Miss Deanesly's work on *The Lollard Bible* rather suggests the contrary (pp. 326 ff.); though it should be remembered that the destruction of the Primers was rather the work of those who, as Cranmer put it in the Introduction to his first Litany (1544), 'thought it convenient to have the commune prayer set furth and used in the vulgar tongue for styrring the people to more devotion'.¹

We have no knowledge concerning the extent of actual use and the place of the Primers in the devotional life of the people. It is just as erroneous to call the Primer a 'liturgical book' (as Maskell does) as it is to regard the Book of Common Prayer as 'a new Primer' (Littlehales).² The Primer was a book for private devotion; it was nothing but an abuse when it was used during Mass. Its use naturally increased with the decrease of illiteracy, the rise of townships, and the possibility of having books printed. When, in the sixteenth century, the idea spread that the education of the people was of benefit to the state, even the temporal rulers took a hand in the compilation of prayer-books for the laity.³ However, a point which even experts such as Dr Ch. Brown⁴ overlooked, they turned the Primer into an educational book. Prefacing or combining it with the ABC, they established the modern use of the word 'Primer'. Yet, as late as 1870, a really devotional *Primer*, expressive of Puseyist tendencies, was published.

The connexion between the Book of Common Prayer and the Primers is indirect, which does not mean that it is unimportant. Whether the Book of Common Prayer is *sui generis* or not can only be decided when we compare the whole extent of

¹ It is owing to the still prevalent interlinking of the study of Middle English religious texts and that of the vernacular Bible versions that it has not been recognized that the local restrictions imposed on the use of the vernacular Bible in the later Middle Ages did not apply to vernacular versions of liturgical books. Indeed, we know of no heresy which originated from an interpretation of liturgical text-books. Similarly, in modern times, the policy of Catholic publishers encourages the reading of the English Bible through the medium of liturgical books which offer the Church's most official interpretation of Biblical texts. Students of Biblical influences in Catholic literature past and present should

be aware of the fact that the liturgy is the principal channel through which Catholics acquire a knowledge of the Bible.

² *Pages in Facsimile of a Laymen's Prayer Book in English*, London, 1890, p. viii; apart from Edmund Bishop's brilliant essay on *The Origin of the Prymers* in conjunction with Littlehales's edition (E.E.T.S. 1897), this is the best introduction to the study of Primers.

³ A survey of the sixteenth-century Primers is given in Maskell's *Monumenta*, vol. III, p. xxxv, and by Whitney, loc. cit.

⁴ *A Study of the Miracle of Our Lady*, London, 1910, pp. 126 ff.

Pre-Reformation English versions with the Prayer Book as a whole, whether the prayers in question actually correspond or not. The significance of the sixteenth-century Primers for this comparison is mainly that they show no longer the characteristic of living liturgies of being anonymous. Unlike the liturgical books of the Roman or Sarum uses, the Book of Common Prayer is the work of an individual (supported perhaps by some assistants). Of the sixteenth-century Primers Mr Whitney significantly says: 'These books lay to Cranmer's hand.'

With regard to the Primers, our study is only at the very beginning. Only three manuscripts have so far been published; of the others we know but the general layout. Their sources, the place and the time of their compilation have not yet been ascertained. After establishing something like a pedigree and a chronological order of the still existing Primers, we should have to study their language in conjunction with both the Latin text and the religious poetry of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries (Ch. Brown). This problem was set by Mr Whitney (*loc. cit.* p. 31) when he said: 'The Reformation, like the Middle Ages, shows a fit expression of devotion and religious thought', a statement at the same time pointing to the necessity of comparing the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Primers, so far as they are comparable. Resting on this broad foundation our study could proceed to the investigation into the right of Dr Doyle's 'principally', Dr Blunt's 'substantially', Mr Belloc's 'presumably', Mr Hutton's 'largely' and Cardinal Newman's 'really'.

It was the purpose of this paper to show the problems involved in the study of the Primer-versions of liturgical prayers and the manifold significance of this study, which may be of special interest with regard to the fourth centenary of the introduction of the English Liturgy (11 June 1544).¹

JOHN HENNIG

DUBLIN

¹ This is the date of Henry VIII's letter to Cranmer. The copy of Cranmer's Litany published by the royal printer Thomas Berthelet, of Fleet Street, bears the date of May 27, 1544.

JOHN DONNE: A NOTE ON ELEGIE V, 'HIS PICTURE'

The close of Donne's fifth Elegie, *His Picture*, presents some difficulty, and Sir Herbert Grierson, in a long note, questioned the reading of the 1633 text, though he printed it with only a slight metrical emendation.¹ The supposed occasion of the poem is a farewell to a mistress by a lover going abroad to the wars. He gives her his picture, his likeness now, and passes swiftly from the conventional thought of his possible death to a vivid description of how he may look when he returns, weather-beaten, coarsened by toil, perhaps maimed:

If rivall fooles taxe thee to have lov'd a man,
So foule, and course, as, Oh, I may seeme than,
This shall say what I was: and thou shalt say,
Doe his hurts reach mee? doth my worth decay?
Or doe they reach his judging minde, that hee
Should now love lesse, what hee did love to see?
That which in him was faire and delicate,
Was but the milke, which in loves childish state
Did nurse it: who now is growne strong enough
To feed on that, which to disused tasts seemes tough.

Sir Herbert Grierson comments: 'The present close of the last line I find difficult to away with. How can a thing seem tough to the taste? Even meat does not *taste* tough: and it is not of meat that Donne is thinking but of wine.'

But it is precisely of *meat*, in the sense of solid food, that Donne is thinking, and the last four lines are based on the Pauline antithesis of milk for babes and meat for grown men. Donne has in mind the use of the phrase in the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, since he links it, as it is linked there, with the idea of use and custom.² But the New Testament reference by itself does not quite make clear the lady's imagined train of thought, and I would suggest that the key to the passage lies in the use made of this text in contemplative literature. Just as in devotional writers a distinction is made between love of Christ in His Manhood, which is for beginners in love, and love of Christ as God and Man, which is too hard for those newly turned to Him, so Donne's mistress distinguishes between her childish love, which was nursed on his outward fairness, and her full-grown love, which has by practice in loving come to feed on 'tougher meat'.

Walter Hilton, in *The Scale of Perfection*, one of the most popular books of devotion in England in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, has a long discussion on three ways of loving God.³ The first, he says, is 'thruugh fayth wythout gracious ymaginacion or ghostly knowyng of god'; the second is the love that 'a soule felyth thorough fayth and ymagynacyon of Jhesu in his manhede';

¹ See *The Poems of John Donne* (Oxford, 1912), I, 87; II, 70. Grierson prints *disused* for the *disus'd* of 1633.

² 'And I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, even as unto babes in Christ. I have fed you with milk, and not with meat: for hitherto ye were not able to bear it' (A.V. I Cor. iii, 1, 2). 'For every one that useth milk is unskilful in the word of righteousness: for he is a babe. But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised

to discern both good and evil' (A.V. Hebrews, v, 13, 14).

³ Book II, chapters 30 and 31. Quotations from *The Scale* are from the edition of Julian Notary of 1507, the only one of the early editions easily accessible at the moment. Abbreviations are expanded, slight printing errors corrected, and the punctuation is modified. The text of the early editions is not a good one, but I have preferred to quote Hilton as he was read in the sixteenth century rather than to use a manuscript.

the third and best is the love that 'the soule feleth thorough ghostly syght of þe godhede in the manhede as it maye be seen here'. In order to distinguish more clearly between these last two ways of loving, Hilton expounds the meaning of the words of the Risen Lord to Mary Magdalene: 'Noli me tangere.'

Mary magdalene loued wel our lorde Jhesu. before the tyme of his passyon, but her loue was moche bodely and lytyl ghostly. She trowed wel þat he was god, but she loued hym a lytyl as god, for she kouth not thenne, and therefore she suffred al her affeccyon and al her thought falle in hym as he was in fourme of man. And our lorde blamed her not thenne but praysed it moche. But after whan he was rysen fro dethe and appered to her she wolde haue worshypped hym with suche manere loue as she dyde before, and thenne our lorde forbode her and sayd thus: 'Towche me not': that is, 'Sette not thy reste ne the loue of thyn herte in that fourme of man þat thou seest with thy fleshly eye, only for to reste therin; for in that fourme I am not styed vp to my fader: that is, I am not euen to the fader, for in that fourme of man I am lesse than he. Towche me not so; but set thy thought and thy loue in þat fourme in whiche I am euen to the fader, that is þe fourme of the godhede, and loue me, knowe me, and worshyp me as god and man godly, not as a man manly.'

At the close of the next chapter Hilton returns to this distinction between two kinds of feeling, when discussing how men are 'reformed in feeling'.

For there is two maner knowynge of god. One is had pryncipally in ymagynacyon, and lytyl in vnderstandyng. This knowyng is in chosen soules, begynnynge and prouffitynge in grace, þat knowen god and louen hym al manly not ghostly, with manly affeccyons and with bodely lyknes as I haue before sayd. This knowynge is good, and it is lykned to mylke by þe whiche they are tenderly nourysshed as chyltern, vntyl they ben able for to come to the faders borde and take of his honde hole brede. Another knowyng is pryncipally feled in vnderstandyng and lytyl in ymagynacyon. For þe vnderstandyng is lady and ymagynacyon is a mayden seruyng to the vnderstandyng whan nede is. Knowyng is hole brede, mete for profyte soules, and it is reformed in felynge.¹

The interpretation of both texts is traditional and they are found linked in St Augustine's *Commentary on the First Epistle of St John*:

Lac nostrum Christus humilis est; cibus noster, idem ipse Christus aequalis Patri. Lacte te nutrit, ut pane pascat: nam corde contingere Jesum spiritualiter, hoc est cognoscere quia aequalis est Patri. Propterea et Mariam prohibebat se tangere, et dicebat ei: *Noli me tangere; nondum enim ascendi ad Patrem*.... Quare ergo se tangi noluisti, nisi quia contactum illum spiritualem intelligi voluisti? Contactus spiritualis est de corde mundo. Ille attingit de corde mundo Christum, qui eum intelligit Patri coaequalem.²

Hilton's discussion also draws on St Bernard's *Sermones in Cantica*, particularly on Sermon xx, 'De triplici modo dilectionis', and the sermons immediately following which develop the distinction between *Amor Carnalis* and *Amor Spiritualis*.

Hilton is an extremely orthodox writer; his ideas are nearly always commonplace. His book was intended to be a kind of digest in the vernacular of traditional mystical theology. It is not necessary therefore to assume that Donne learned of this use of the text from Hilton, but it is on the other hand far from improbable that he knew *The Scale of Perfection*. The five editions between 1494 and 1533 are a witness to its popularity just before the Reformation, and it was one of the books recommended by name to the laity by Sir Thomas More in his *Confutation of Tyndale* in 1532. More advised 'the people vnlearned to occupye them self beside their other busines in praier, good meditacion, and reading of suche englishe

¹ The text is faulty here. MS. Harley 6579 reads: 'Þis knowynge is hol brede, mete for þe perfitte soules, and it is reformynge in felynge.'

² Migne, P.L. xxxv, col. 1998.

bookes as moste may noryshe and encrease deuocion. Of which kind is Bonauenture of the lyfe of Christe, Gerson of the folowing of Christ, and the deuoute contemplatiue booke of *Scala perfectionis* wyth suche other lyke'.¹ The advice would seem to have been followed, as one would expect, only by those who, like More, remained within the Roman Church. Except for *The Imitation* these books vanished from the presses in England. But among the exiled congregations abroad they were familiar reading, and presumably their fellow-Romanists at home continued to 'noryshe and encrease deuocion' by the use of them. Helen More, great-granddaughter of Sir Thomas, in religion Dame Gertrude More, quoted Hilton's *Scale* at length in her mystical writings, as did her Confessor, the famous Father Baker. Father Baker's letter to Sir Robert Cotton, asking for a Latin manuscript of *The Scale*, implies that the nuns in his charge at Cambrai regularly used the English, but were finding difficulty in understanding its by then archaic language.² It is highly probable that Elizabeth Donne, with her connexions with the More circle, and her contacts with the exiles through her Jesuit brother, followed Sir Thomas More's advice, and had Hilton's book and others like it read in her household.

But whether Donne knew of the use of the Pauline 'milk for babes' in this connexion from Augustine, or from Hilton, or from pious talk heard in his youth does not very much matter. What is suggested here is that if we know the passages in Augustine or in Hilton there is no difficulty in understanding the lady's speech in the poem. As the lover gives her the picture and thinks of how he may look on his return, he puts into her mouth what he hopes she would say to those who wondered at her for loving so 'foul and coarse' a man. She will, he hopes, declare that his injuries do not 'reach' her and leave her 'worth' unaffected, and since they do not touch his 'judging mind' there is no reason why he should love her less. As for her own feelings, she will assert that when her love was new and childish it was nursed on the outward beauty of his form and face, but that now, when it is mature and strong, it is able to feed on the 'meat' of his inner self, which is too hard or 'tough' for beginners in love to enjoy. The difficulty lies in the seemingly abrupt change of thought before the last four lines, but the sequence of thought is really quite direct. Having declared that his love for her is unchanged, she asserts by implication that it is this, 'his judging mind', and not the beauty which he has lost, which is the true food of her love for him. We have in this poem a hint of the theme developed with far greater subtlety and beauty and under a different series of images in *Aire and Angels*, that what the lover seeks ultimately in the beloved is love.

The Ecstasie is by no means the only one of Donne's love poems that makes use of the doctrines of mystical theology. There is very little use made of them in his religious poetry or in the *Sermons*, which, like most Anglican sermons of the period, concentrate upon dogmatic and moral theology. The school of divines to which he belonged, and of which he is so great an ornament, was little interested in mysticism, and was renowned for its learned sobriety and the emphasis it placed on the duties of ordinary life and the importance of public worship. It has been

¹ *The Workes of Sir Thomas More* (London, 1557), p. 356D. The second of the books named is *The Imitation of Christ*, ascribed to John Gerson by the sixteenth-century English translators. There are many editions in England throughout the sixteenth century. *The Short Title Catalogue* gives editions of Nicholas Love's translation of

the *Speculum Vitae Christi* from 1486 to 1530; after that the next edition listed is from Douai in 1590. The last sixteenth-century edition of *The Scale* was in 1533; it next appeared in a modernized edition in 1659.

² Printed in Ellis, *Original Letters* (Second Series, London, 1827), III, 256.

said that one of the weaknesses of the Anglican school in the seventeenth century was that 'at times their emphasis on liturgy made them undervalue the place of private prayer in the life of the soul. Jeremy Taylor, Granville and Ken are almost the only persons touched by the school who betray any knowledge of contemplative prayer; the majority appear content with discursive meditation. Granville used Father Baker's *Holy Wisdom*; he thought, however, he should be read with caution and found him very "enthusiastical"'.¹ One would expect Hooker, in his great defence of the Book of Common Prayer, to exalt public prayer over private,² but Donne speaks just as emphatically. He claims that public prayer is more acceptable and effectual than private, and declares that his own prayers are more fervent in a congregation than when alone.³

Mrs Austin Duncan Jones, of the University of Birmingham, has shown me an unpublished study of some notable conversions to Rome in the seventeenth century. She considers that one of the main reasons, beside the uncertain future of the Church of England, was that the English Church 'had allowed the religious life and the practice of contemplative prayer to fall into desuetude'. She brought to my notice Serenus de Cressy's *Exomologesis*, where there is a most affecting account of his visit to the Carthusians of Paris in 1644. Cressy makes it clear that he was completely ignorant of mystical theology before he went to Paris. He says of Protestants that 'the very name of *Contemplation* is unknown among them, I mean in the mysticall sense: for all that is understood among them in their Treatises of devotion by that word, is only the descanting upon any mystery of divinity, or passage of Scripture'.⁴ In the controversy between Cressy and Clarendon in the 1670's Clarendon, in reply to Cressy's complaint that the Church of England lacked religious houses, reminded him that 'himself had his education in a *Religious house* founded by *Walter Merton*, where he received a much more liberal and bountiful education, and support, than he hath ever had from *S. Benedict*'.⁵ Throughout Clarendon implies that writers like St Theresa and Cressy's master Father Baker are unintelligible to educated persons.

A recent study of Donne as a theologian,⁶ in spite of its misleading title, shows clearly how much Donne is in agreement on this point with the school he helped to establish. Mr Husain devotes only twenty-three of his hundred and fifty pages to mystical theology, and begins his chapter on that subject by stating that there is not enough material in the *Sermons* and other prose works for an exhaustive survey. He goes on to say quite truly that Donne does not deal at all with the various forms of prayer, and the sentences he then collects to illustrate Donne's conception and experience of the mystical stages of Purgation, Illumination and Union, though paralleled by passages from the great mystical doctors, only serve to show how little Donne as a preacher has to say on the interior life. The unmystical temper and method of the *Devotions* prevents us from suggesting that it is only his conception of the preacher's office that keeps these topics out of the *Sermons*.

Donne's obvious acquaintance with mystical writings shown in his secular poetry, and the lack of reference to mystical theology in his religious poems and

¹ G. W. O. Addleshaw, *The High Church Tradition* (London, 1941), p. 59.

² *Ecclesiastical Polity*, Book v, 24.

³ *LXXX Sermons*, pp. 688 and 264. See also pp. 35, 90, 370.

⁴ *Exomologesis* (second edition, Paris, 1653), pp. 453-69. (The pagination of this section is

hopelessly confused. The quotation occurs on p. 465 numbered 443.)

⁵ *Animadversions upon a Book intituled Fanaticism fanatically imputed to the Catholick Church etc.* (London, 1673), p. 92.

⁶ Itrat Husain, *The Dogmatic and Mystical Theology of John Donne* (London, 1938).

sermons might be explained in two ways. We might point out legitimately that many of his greatest love poems rest on the prime mystical assumption that love is the supreme mode of knowing, and suggest that he found in love something he never found in religion, an intense experience of release from self and a sense of fulfilment in union with another. This would naturally bring to his mind the analogous experience of the contemplative, familiar to him from the pious reading of his youth. It need, I hope, hardly be said that this explanation in no way impugns the sincerity of Donne's religious convictions.

On the other hand, we might say that Donne's love poetry is both extremely traditional and extremely original, and that his originality lies partly in his use of any and every tradition which came to his hand, including the venerable tradition by which divine and human love interchanged images and doctrines. We would then say that the use he makes of mystical doctrines no more makes his love poetry mystical, than the use of philosophic ideas makes it truly metaphysical, and that he neglected such ideas in his later work because he had outgrown the intellectual curiosity which led him in his youth to explore all modes of human thought and experience. If we accept this explanation, we see Donne as one who in his later life 'stooped to truth', and strove to avoid

excesse

In seeking secrets, or Poetiquenesse.

HELEN L. GARDNER

OXFORD

THE CONVENTION OF THE STOIC HERO AS HANDLED BY MARSTON

Florio's translation of Montaigne's *Essays* was licensed in 1601 and published in 1603, the year which saw the piratical publication of the First Quarto of *Hamlet*. This translation had a profound effect upon the development of Jacobean drama. Not only did it make current and available a valuable 'commonplace book' of philosophical quotations, but the habit itself of philosophical speculation was fostered, popular drama becoming more intellectual in its design upon Jacobean audiences. Montaigne's curious erudition, the freshness and charm of his style, and the peculiar modernity of his philosophic balance all combined to give a more reflective character to the drama of the early seventeenth century and to create a popular interest in philosophy. The translation brought Englishmen into contact with a writer who was capable of giving a fresh colouring and applicability to the wisdom of the ancients. In those plays of Shakespeare and Marston which, written at the beginning of the century, cover roughly the same emotional and intellectual ground, there runs a vein of thought owing much to Montaigne and indicated by parallels of phrase and theme, clear but not frequent in Shakespeare, in Marston acknowledged by scholars to be very numerous.¹ More profound than these easily identifiable instances of a direct contact is the manner in which both dramatists take certain stoical and sceptical elements in Montaigne's thought and use them to illustrate or bring into relief the pessimism and melancholia of the Jacobean age.

Marston's two *Antonio* tragedies and the *Malcontent* are linked to Shakespeare's great tragic period by the striking resemblances of intellectual and emotional matter which the plays contain, for it is in these early plays of Marston and Shakespeare that we find those first statements of the belief, thereafter to be reiterated with a desperate insistence, that the powers of evil are possessed of an overwhelming energy and scope, the conviction that

There glowe no sparkes of reason in the world;
All are rak't up in ashie beastlinesse.
The bulke of man's as darke as *Erebus*,
No branch of Reasons light hangs in his trunke.²

Both Marston and Shakespeare use variants of the Gentillet-Machiavel type to represent the vigour of the power of evil, its seemingly inexhaustible fertility in devising wickedness, its power to reduce ordered happiness to a bitter and meaningless chaos. We are not here concerned to examine the vast fields of pessimistic speculation and tragic surmise which compose this melancholy period, nor to trace the very varied causes which combined to create it.³ It is, however, interesting to note by what means the dramatists sought to represent the guardian and last defender of the human citadel thus perilously encircled by the powers of evil—the man

Whom fortunes lowdest thunder can not daunt,
Whom fretful gaules of chance, sterne fortunes siege,
Makes not his reason slinke, the soules faire liege.⁴

¹ Vide Fies's *Shakespeare and Montaigne*, Robertson's *Montaigne and Shakespeare*, Crawford's *Collectanea*, 2nd series.

² *Antonio's Revenge*, act i, sc. 4. References are to the edition of Marston by H. H. Wood.

³ Vide Miss U. Ellis-Fermor's *Jacobean Tragedy*, and G. B. Harrison's Preface to Breton's *Melancholick Humours*; also Harrison's Preface to Marston's *Scourge of Villainie*.

⁴ Marston's *Antonio's Revenge*, act ii, sc. 5.

For a variety of reasons it was natural that the stoic hero should at this time again make his appearance in drama, though stripped of the particular religious associations with which the 'Sacred Senecans' had invested him.¹ For religious humanists the stoic had symbolized the sense of moral exclusiveness which their theological belief had conferred on them, or perhaps he might be the righteous heretic persecuted by a corrupt and tyrannous ruler; again, he might have a political affiliation, and oppose to the injustice of modern monarchy an antique republican virtue.

Some of these older associations are revived by Chapman in a majestic series of philosophic and political tragedies. The introduction of dramatic stoicism by Marston and in a more subtle form by Shakespeare is due to the new interest in the stoic philosophy which had become fashionable in intellectual circles throughout Europe during the latter part of the sixteenth century and which had begun to affect English thought and letters² at the turn of the century. It is as a system of practical morality with secular tendencies that we meet the philosophy in England, where it created the popular interest and knowledge needed before the intellectual quality of much of *Hamlet*, of all of the two parts of *Antonio and Mellida*, and of much subsequent tragic drama, could be apprehended by the play-going public. Stoicism had come to mean something more arresting and significant, certainly something more fashionable, than a secularized variant of Calvinistic morality.³ The successful attempt to create from it a system of practical morals suited to the needs of contemporary man led directly to a revival of interest in the stoicism of Seneca, of Cicero, of Plutarch, and of the lesser known *Encheiridion* of Epictetus,⁴ a collection of stoic precepts with a commentary by Simplicius which attained great popularity in the early seventeenth century. Seneca's moral essays remain, however, one of the chief sources for stoic material, and it is in recognition of this that Chapman calls his ideal stoic by the name 'Senecal Man', though here his debt is actually less to Seneca than to Epictetus. Another source of fruitful suggestions was North's *Plutarch* published in 1579, a book of which Shakespeare made no use till the year 1600, about that time when he was receiving and making immediate use of the many philosophic suggestions contained in Montaigne. There were, finally, the stoic situations and colouring of thought which were a natural inheritance of all who stood in the following of Seneca the Dramatist.⁵ Such were the literary precedents of the stoic sage. The dramatic type cannot be dissociated from the philosophy of neo-stoicism. 'Senecal Man' is a character devised to illustrate a philosophical principle, a theory of moral excellence. That is why Shakespeare eschews the use of the convention, though he does not hesitate to draw from the philosophy certain hints which he uses in the creation of his tragic heroes.

In the first and second parts of *Antonio and Mellida* Marston, working on two characters, Andrugio and Pandulpho, develops his conception of the stoic hero. Shakespeare, as we should expect, rejects the use of a character who bears less

¹ Cf. Boas's *University Drama*; Herford's *Literary Relations*; Rolland's *Introduction to Jephthes*.

² Neo-stoicism is the philosophical counterpart to the strong classical aesthetic established first in France in the seventeenth century and thereafter throughout Europe. Malherbe is a representative of the two tendencies, aesthetic and philosophic. He does for French verse what du Vair does for French prose. Both are

stoics preaching a dignified submission to the Divine Will.

³ Lipsius's *Constancy* was translated by Sir John Stradling in 1595. Du Vair's *Moral Philosophy of the Stoics* was translated by T. James in 1598.

⁴ The influence of the Latin edition is traced by Schoell in *L'Épictète Latin de Hiéronymus Wolfius en Angleterre*.

⁵ Cf. Cunliffe's *Influence of Seneca on Elizabethan Tragedy*.

relation to life than to a specific philosophy of life. We find, however, in *Hamlet* and in the subsequent tragedies, that Shakespeare is thinking along lines similar to those which had led Marston to create the characters of Pandulpho and Andrugio. The stoic is a man

that Fortune's buffets and rewards
Hast ta'en with equal thanks; and blest are those
Whose blood and judgement are so well commingled
That they are not a pipe for Fortune's finger
To sound what stop she please.¹

Both Shakespeare and Marston explore the possibilities of the stoic vein. Marston goes directly to his task, abstracting from the philosophy what he needs to create in Andrugio a transitional figure, partly a Kydian hero of unrestrained passion, partly a stoic struggling to subdue passion to reason. Pandulpho, a careful and elaborate study in stoic psychology, is the first attempt in English popular drama to present a philosophical sage, conducting his life according to the principles of patience and of constancy which Seneca had set forth in his moral epistles. He is the prototype of Chapman's Clermont d'Ambois and Tournear's Charlemont. Shakespeare seems to have realized from the start that the dispassionate and coldly rational figure of the stoic, withdrawn from the arena of human emotions and sympathies, is not a subject suitable for tragic treatment. Marston and Chapman, on the other hand, identify themselves enthusiastically with their philosophical heroes. The infinitely subtle and penetrating study of Brutus is Shakespeare's comment on the full stoic doctrine of self-sufficiency. He is well aware that 'man will break out despite Philosophy',² that there is no convenient philosophical armour easily to be assumed, and proof against these 'Despairs and mighty Grievs' which inhabit the tragic scene. The stoic attitude is, however, one so dramatically valuable that it will be used in contexts not of a strictly stoic or Senecan character, though it may often be little more than a useful emotional attitude assumed by the tragic hero whose environment happens to be the anarchism of the later Renaissance. Marston needs the stoic nobility, its qualities of constancy and of resignation, in order to throw into blacker contrast the false and rotten world of human normality, a world 'too subtil for honest natures to converse withall'. This is the function of Andrugio and of Pandulpho. They are men whose virtue distinguishes and separates them from the evil and corruption of the common world. Lear and Othello also bear this character of men who suffer in isolation, not comprehending the nature of the evil which is done them. In the midst of the appalling disaster and ruin which Hamlet and Othello have produced, each man is content in his ending to 'erect himself upon himself' in a fashion not dissimilar from the stoic self-sufficiency and isolated pride of Pandulpho and Clermont d'Ambois. Othello has reached his journey's end, the butt and seamark of his utmost sail, yet, like Hamlet, he must needs attempt justification for himself in an infinitely pathetic sort of self-praise.³ Interwoven with the bright images of a poetry almost Oriental in its phantasy, we can hear again, as the splendid words roll out, the ancient comfort of the Senecan hero: 'Medea superest':

'I am Anthony still,'
'I am Duchess of Malfi still,'
'There's nothing left unto Andrugio, but Andrugio,'
'Speak of me as I am; nothing extenuate.'

¹ *Hamlet*, act iii, sc. 2.

² *Othello*, act v, sc. 2, ll. 340-56.

³ *Antonio's Revenge*, act iv, sc. 5.

The strict stoic moralist would have condemned Othello for permitting himself to gather up his heart and bestow it in any human shrine. 'Reason', Seneca and Epictetus would have coolly observed, 'is the true fountain from which our current runs; if we attempt to draw it from any other source we must expect "to be discarded thence".'

Marston is more intimately bound to the English Senecan tradition itself, though as with Shakespeare the study of Florio's Montaigne has contributed to the ripening of his intellect. A large number of verbal parallels between Marston and Florio have been discovered, along with some vaguer, less precisely defined affinities of thought and sentiment. Both Marston and Shakespeare tend on the whole to turn the spirit of Montaigne's thought to a deeper pessimism. Marston had created the stoic type, acting perhaps on a suggestion from that rich mine of dramatic and psychological invention, the *Spanish Tragedy*.¹ His use of the convention illustrates his desire to make his tragedy a drama of contrasts: the Machiavel is pitted against the Stoic, and a self-sufficing virtue defends 'the pales and forts of reason' against irrational and anarchic evil. It is an atmosphere common to the Jacobean and Senecan ages: 'O nos dura sorte creatos', cries Seneca; so, too, Marston's men and women are 'Nailed to the earth with grief'. For him man is born to sin and suffering:

His mature age growes onely mature vice,
And ripens onely to corrupt and rot
The budding hopes of infant modestie.²

Marston's treatment of the stoic cannot be understood apart from this attempt of his to depict universal evil. Piero and Pandulpho are simply philosophic principles, embodied in a not very convincing humanity, and brought into dramatic opposition in order to illustrate Marston's religious and philosophical convictions about the contemporary world.

Shakespeare's attitude is equally clear, though he knows too well the function of the poetic interpreter of life to identify himself with any one character in the contest. Marston has no such delicacy of mental balance, and he declaims with an angry, outraged and erudite virtue through the mouths of stoics and satirists alike. Indeed, Marston is as much at pains to identify himself with his nobler heroes as he is with the bitterer sort of his moral satirists. Whether in comedy or tragedy he wants to associate his personal views with a figure external to the world which he is seeking to anatomize. Jonson had used this attitude of isolation in creating his satirists; Marston, so far as I am aware, is the first dramatist who carries the same conception into the field of tragedy. Here, too, there must be one exempt from sin and crime, as the satiric observer of life is exempt from its follies and vices:

A wise man wrongfully, but never wrong
Can take: his breast's of such well tempered prooffe,
It may be rac'd, not pearc't by savage tooth
Of foaming malice.³

Othello and Iago are the nearest that Shakespeare gets to this identification of good and evil with individual characters, and here the tragic action comes from a

¹ *Spanish Tragedy*, act iv, sc. 4. Hieronimo's stoical death is modelled on the account of the death of Zeno in *Euphues* (ed. Arber, p. 146).

² *Antonio's Revenge*, act iii, sc. 2.

³ *Antonio's Revenge*, act ii, sc. 2. The original is Seneca's 'Nec injuriam nec contumeliam accipere sapientem'.

disturbance in the hero's balance, from his failure to maintain his character as a man

whose solid virtue
The shot of accident nor dart of chance
Could neither graze nor pierce.¹

So far from remaining the man whom passion cannot shake Othello has become, inevitably Shakespeare would tell us, a man grappled to life by those passions which are the accompaniment of sexual love.² Shakespeare's villains often speak as Machiavellians, his heroes will in speech and purpose remind us at times that stoicism was popular and apposite; Jaques has a humorous fashionable melancholy, and Hamlet is an intellectual malcontent; but every type is sublimated, every element which he has got by ransacking time and space (and his contemporaries) is made to serve what is his own picture of psychological truth. The lendings aid but do not obstruct the poet's vision of humanity. Shakespeare, Middleton and Webster are in this the superiors of Jonson, Marston and Chapman, whose characters are too often 'docile creations of their authors' beliefs, as they are their glib exponents'. The satirist in Marston, the preacher in him perhaps, craved for overstatement, was not deeply interested in the subtleties of human psychology, laid on crude colours and charged his plays with the perilous subjective matter of what Mr Eliot has called 'his perverted and obstructed genius'. Like Chapman and Tourneur who follow him in making drama from the stoic-machiavellian antithesis, Marston is deeply interested in philosophic speculation. As early as 1598 he is adding a few wholesome touches to the frantic babel of the *Scourge of Villainie*, touches which come from the sanest, most genuine and meditative of the stoic philosophers, Epictetus. A Latin version of the *Encheiridion* with the commentary of Simplicius had for some time been available. Sanford's English version of the French translation had been published in 1567.³ Next to Seneca, Epictetus was probably the most read of the stoic writers, and he is the central inspiration of European neo-stoicism. The Epictetan passivity is beyond the reach of Marston's angry violence of spirit:

Preach not the stoic's patience to me;
I hate not man, but men's impiety.⁴

Thus early Marston's satiric attitude of moral reproof was hardening to a sort of stoic self-sufficiency intensely idiosyncratic in form:

Spight of despight and rancorous villainie
I am myself, so is my poesie.⁵

By 1606, when he was writing the preface to *The Fawn*, Marston had made sufficient progress in his study of the Greek writer to proclaim his adherence to Epictetan philosophy: 'As for the factious malice, and studied detractions of some few that tread in the same path with me, let all know I most easily neglect them, and (carelessly stumbling to their vitious endeavours) smile hartily at their self-hurting basenesse. My bosom friend good Epictetus makes me easily to contemne all such men's malice; since other men's tongues are not within my teeth, why should I

¹ *Othello*, act iv, sc. 1.

² *Othello*, act ii, sc. 3:

'Passion, having my best judgment collied,
Assays to lead the way.'

³ *The Manuell of Epictetus*, translated out of Greek into French, and now into English, conferred with two Latin translations. Here-

unto are annexed Annotations, and also the Apothegs of the same author by J^a. Sanford. (1567). Healy translated *The Manual* again in 1610.

⁴ *The Scourge of Villainie*.

⁵ *The Scourge of Villainie*.

hope to govern them?' And he added, as if to confirm this discipleship, a thought alien to his usual restless bitterness: 'I esteem felecity to be a more solid contentment (than Fame).' An Epictetan note which is sustained throughout the preface.

Marston's connexion with neo-stoicism is thus clearly shown. In the two studies which he makes of stoic psychology he does not make any direct use of Epictetus. There are among Andrugio's moralizings and Pandulpho's obtrusive stoicism none of those evidences of direct contact with Wolfius's translation which mark the speeches of Chapman's Clermont d'Ambois.¹ The technical vocabulary is wanting, nor can we trace the lines of meditation and religious thought, fruits of a balanced and contemplative mind, which to Chapman's more mystical temperament were the most valuable and attractive things Epictetus had to offer. The chief props with which Marston supports the stoic theme in *Antonio and Mellida* and in *Antonio's Revenge* are Seneca's two tragedies, *Thyestes* and *Hercules Furens*, the moral treatises, in particular *De Constantia Sapientis* and *De Providentia*, and the usual borrowings of Montaigne's classical erudition. It is from these sources that he gets the *sententiae*, Latin and English, and the moral aphorisms which make up the substance of Andrugio's and Pandulpho's discourse.

Andrugio's ancestry goes back to Kyd's hero of unbridled passion. He is one of those who give way to their emotions with the full vigour of their being, who can despair like Richard II, Garnier's Cornelia and Hieronimo in the *Spanish Tragedy*. Antonio, Andrugio's son, is a man entirely of this school. Any control of the emotions is outside his province. He is a seventeenth-century hero of sensibility. Everything strange and fantastically unreal in the baroque personality of the Renaissance Englishman is represented for us in these frantic figures. In the struggle between Patience and Grief, Antonio is of the school of Hieronimo:

Patience is slave to fooles: a chaine that's fixt
Onely to postes, and senselesse log-like dolts.²

Nor does he believe that it is

reasons glorie to commaund affects.³

It is only

Pigmie cares
Can shelter under patience shield: but gyant griefes
Will burst all covert.⁴

This conflict of two conceptions of heroic conduct fills the two Antonio plays of Marston and such plays as *Lear*, *Othello* and *Julius Caesar*.

Throughout these plays of Marston and of Shakespeare in which the new conception of a hero of restrained patience is opposed to or in some degree modifying the 'hysterica passio' of the older tradition, we can trace the gradual change of acting technique which the improvement in public taste was imposing on the Drama: the new restrained style of acting fitted well with a conception of sober conduct which educational and social developments of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were to make a peculiarly English characteristic. Whether by virtue of classical learning or by a process of natural attraction stoicism entered

¹ Except perhaps Antonio's

'Pish, most things that morally adhere to soules,
Wholly exist in drunke opinion',

where 'opinion' seems to be a translation of the

Epictetan ἐπὶ δόξης. Cf. also *Antonio and Mellida*, act iv:

'Unmov'd, Despight the justling of opinion.'

² *Antonio's Revenge*, act i, sc. 5.

³ *Antonio's Revenge*, act i, sc. 5.

⁴ *Antonio's Revenge*, act ii, sc. 3.

deeply into English ideas of moral conduct and became an ingredient in the English 'gravitas' of character.

In the character of Andrugio the conventional outbursts of passion are varied, and their dramatic effect enhanced, by moments during which the man attempts to curb his grief. Lear and Othello, through their inner conflict of passion and patience, create in us a sense of tragic intensity and gain thereby in stature and majesty. The scene between Brutus and Cassius is in terms of psychological truth the most mature and balanced statement of the conflict. It is by depicting the human spirit arming itself with the philosophy of Seneca and Epictetus that Marston succeeds in creating the impression of a grief too deep for tears:

There's nothing left
Unto *Andrugio*, but *Andrugio*:
And that nor mischief, force, distresse, nor hel can take,
Fortune my fortunes, not my minde shall shake.¹

In a vigorous and martial passage Andrugio expresses the symbolic meaning which this conflict of the inner world bears:

Would'st thou have me go unarm'd among my foes?
Being besieg'd by passion, entring lists,
To combat with despaire and mightie grieve:
My soule beleaguerd with the crushing strength
Of sharpe impatience.²

Passion and despair and the crushing strength of sharp impatience are the enemies of the tranquil spirit. After more open grief and mourning Andrugio assumes the familiar attitude of self-dramatization, stoical in moments of tragic intensity:

Well, ere yon sunne set, ile shew my selfe my selfe,
Worthy my blood. I was a Duke; that's all.
No matter whether, but from whence we fall.³

It is this spiritual isolation conventionally, yet vividly stated that perhaps led Lamb to compare this particular scene with 'the royal impatience, the turbulent greatness, the affected resignation' of Lear.⁴ In a series of rapidly moving scenes which present the pin-pricking malice of Goneril and Regan we see Lear, like Andrugio, like Othello, seeking, in some place of the soul, a drop of patience to allay the enemy passion; he will be the pattern of all patience, saying nothing. As with Andrugio, the emotional excitement is increased by the spectacle of the King's painful efforts to achieve calm, to be patient, to be the man who is not passion's slave, broken as these intervals of sanity are by outbursts of despairing passion.

'No, I will weep no more', says Lear. 'I will endure.'

And Marston heavily underlines the stoic idealism involved in this struggle:

Spit on me *Lucio*, for I am turn'd slave:
Observe how passion domineres ore me.⁵

Andrugio is the first of two studies which Marston made of stoic psychology; the second, Pandulpho, is a full-length portrait of the stoic sage:

Whose brow is wreathed with the silver crowne
Of cleare content.⁶

¹ *Antonio and Mellida*, act iii.

² *Antonio and Mellida*, act iii.

³ Seneca, *Thyestes*, line 925:

'Magis unde cadas
Quam quo refert',

and *Antonio and Mellida*, act iii.

⁴ Lamb's *Specimens of the English Dramatic Poets*.

⁵ *Antonio and Mellida*, act iv.

⁶ *Antonio and Mellida*, act iv.

Pandulpho's conquest over passion is so complete that he suffers from a bloodless quality as dramatically unmanageable as his opposite, the expressionist hero of passion and unruly emotion. Such is his propriety of conduct, his self-control and his unfailing aptitude for apposite Senecan quotation, that it is a little surprising to find him engaging, with considerable refinement of technique,¹ in the melodramatic hero's game of vengeance. Marston's conception of revenge was probably in accord with popular Renaissance feeling on the subject.² He depicts it as a kind of wild justice, an official instrument of law which the hero, however deeply penetrated by a morality which implies a quiet and sedate social conduct, need not scruple to use, even if it leads to blood and violence. The conflict which ought to exist between the conventional idea of revenge and the new stoic morality is not touched on by Marston. Chapman's Clermont d'Ambois is a reluctant and chivalrous revenger. Tournour's Charlemont is tortured between the passion of his blood and the religion of his soul, eventually leaving vengeance to the King of Kings. The long dispute between passionate action and a passivity which resigns to the Divine keeping the vengeance due for murder comes to a close with Charlemont's:

Only to heav'n I attribute the worke,
Whose gracious motives made me still forbear
To be mine owne Revenger. Now I see
That Patience is the honest man's revenge.³

Chapman's Clermont represents, in his attitude to the ethics of revenge, an English compromise. He does not abstain from action like Charlemont nor, forgetful of his recently uttered mild wisdom like Pandulpho, run to vengeance with exultant cries.⁴

Clermont's stoicism is of a sort adapted to the highest ethics consistent with the conduct of a contemporary gentleman of honour and spirit. Vengeance according to the rules of the duello is his maxim. There is no evidence that the need for a moral adjustment between the characters of the revenger and the stoic ever suggested itself to Marston. In Pandulpho he is content to add the moral dignity of the stoic to the popular figure of the revenger without attempting to harmonize the conflicting elements. It is enough for Marston to erect in the darkness and anarchism of a late Renaissance world this quaint Jacobean image of stoical virtue, armed with the authority of antiquity and doing battle against the powers of machiavellian evil. For we can never consider the stoic figure apart from its environment of sin and moral chaos. Virtuous conduct is exceptional conduct, and normal humanity is symbolized for Marston in the figure of Piero, the machiavellian Duke. Evil probably attracted as well as appalled Marston, and Piero's speeches have in them many images of beauty and macabre power. Antonio, too, in his brooding on the spectacle of mortality, can use a language of great imaginative beauty. To Pandulpho the pattern of virtuous living is granted only a thin sermonizing strain of language feeble in diction and untouched by Marston's rare poetic fire. Marston's stoic is cousin-germane to his scourger of villainy; Pandulpho's speeches are homilies along the familiar lines of the Puritan pamphlets against vice:

He may of valour vaunt;
Whom fortunes lowdest thunder can not daunt,
Whom fretful gauls of chance, sterne fortunes sieg,
Makes not his reason slinke, the soules fair liege;

¹ *Antonio's Revenge*, act v, sc. 5.

² Vide *Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy*, by F. T. Bowers, which discusses the relation between Revenge Tragedy and current morality, and

Divine Vengeance by Sister Mary Bonaventure Mroz.

³ *Atheist's Tragedy*, act v, sc. 2.

⁴ *Antonio's Revenge*, act v, sc. 3.

Whose well pais'd action ever rests upon
 Not giddie humours, but discretion.
 This heart in valour even *Jove* out-goes:
Jove is without, but this 'bove sense of woes.¹

Marston lacks that union of poetic fantasy and human wisdom whereby the poets create characters which are the true images of life. In these two plays disgust at human frailty, the confidence of a divine election and a sense of the remorseless action of Providence send us back to the 'Sacred Seneca' and forward again to the *Atheist's Tragedy* and *The Revenger's Tragedy*. Pandulpho suggests at times the contemporary puritan moralist; he has the confidence and the ready assurance in his authority, the utterance larded with texts, though these are classical in origin, not scriptural; he has a stoic and a puritan arrogance which is the reverse of Christian humility. If he were human, he would be priggish as Aurelius is sometimes priggish, and as many a puritan moralist in life and literature has since been priggish. The character of Pandulpho is the symbol and proof of a weakness evident in every page which Marston wrote. This man could summon the shapes of villainy and folly and corruption and vice with a remarkable imaginative power: called on to create a figure of positive virtue and living active beauty, he can conjure up only an empty phantom imagined from dry texts and the unilluminated wisdom of antiquity.

MICHAEL HIGGINS

CAMBRIDGE

¹ *Antonio's Revenge*, act i, sc. 5. The chain of thoughts roughly follows the passage in *De Providentia*, cap. vi, read by Antonio and charac-

terized by him as 'Naught but fomie bubblings of a fleamie braine'.

LE ROLE DE LA NATURE DANS 'L'IPHIGENIE' DE RACINE

Iphigénie en Aulide est un drame à grand spectacle. Même les contemporains l'ont reconnu. Il suffit de lire les détails de l'encadrement si curieux, au fond si inapproprié qu'aménagèrent les régisseurs du théâtre louisquatorzien pour la pièce qui, avec *Mithridate*, devait rester leur préférée. Les voici, d'après le *Mercur* *Ga*lant :

La décoration représentoit une longue allée de verdure où, de part et d'autre, il y avoit des bassins de fontaines et, d'espace en espace, des grottes d'un travail rustique, mais travaillé très délicatement. Sur leur entablement régnait une balustrade où étoient arrangés des vases de porcelaine pleins de fleurs; les bassins des fontaines étoient de marbre blanc, soutenus par des tritons dorés et, dans ces bassins, on en voyoit d'autres plus élevés qui portoient de grandes statues d'or. Cette allée se terminait dans le fond du théâtre par des tentes qui avoient rapport à celles qui couvroient l'orchestre; et au-delà paroissoit une longue allée qui étoit l'allée même de l'Orangerie, bordée des deux côtés de grands orangers et de grenadiers entremêlés de vases de porcelaine remplis de diverses fleurs. Entre chaque arbre il y avoit de grands candélabres et des guéridons d'or et d'azur qui portoient des girandoles de cristal allumées de plusieurs bougies. Cette allée finissoit par un portique de marbre; les pilastres qui en soutenoient la corniche étoient de lapis et la porte paroissoit toute d'orfèvrerie. Sur ce théâtre, orné de la manière que je viens de dire, la troupe des comédiens du roi représenta la tragédie d'*Iphigénie*.

Tout cela, c'est assurément du pseudo-grec ! On a l'impression d'assister à une fête dans un salon de *Biedermeierzeit* allemand fin dix-huitième siècle. Seules les tentes avaient quelque rapport avec le paysage normalement attribué à un drame de la sorte d'*Iphigénie*. Toutefois, l'effort évident pour faire de la pièce un tableau du genre *merveilleux* se laisse deviner. Sans doute, cette mise en scène ne pouvait-elle aucunement correspondre à celle qui existait dans l'esprit de Racine, mais on ne peut que remarquer un progrès dans l'appréciation des contemporains pour le genre de scénario qui devait convenir, selon eux, à un drame grec au dix-septième siècle, à un drame vraiment grec. Après leur avoir concédé cela, il ne reste plus rien à dire sur cette mise en scène, grotesque au fond.

Pour Racine, et pour nous qui apprécions avec le recul du temps, *Iphigénie* est un drame à grand spectacle non pas parce que la Grèce où il se joue paraît comme un pays de richesses un peu mignardes ou d'art un peu surraffiné; mais parce que le complot dépend entièrement d'immenses phénomènes naturels, des dieux, des vents, de la mer, et parce que l'ensemble des détails dont est cousue la pièce suggère éminemment la puissance des éléments physiques de la nature.

L'emplacement du drame est certainement de toute première importance. Une fois encore, nous avons affaire au port de mer entouré presque de toutes parts de promontoires et de caps—paysage affectionné par Racine, et bien dans la tradition grecque. Pourtant, le site est tel que Racine a dû y voir des possibilités auxquelles il n'avait pu songer lorsqu'il s'agissait de Buthrote, d'Ostie, ou de Nymphée. C'est que la ville d'Aulis et la contrée de l'Aulide dominant, ou peu s'en faut, la baie et la ville de Chalcis; et nous aimons à croire que si Racine n'a pas poursuivi le dessein qu'il avait élaboré quelques années plus tôt d'une *Iphigénie en Tauride* (dont il nous reste en fragment le premier acte), c'est pour des raisons topographiques peut-être plus même que pour des raisons dramatiques proprement dites.

Car il n'y a pas à le nier, sa technique en 1674 est nettement une *technique de la*

nature.¹ L'entourage mystérieux qui pousse l'univers humain à l'activité a passé du rang de confident au rang de personnage pour atteindre maintenant celui de force motrice de l'action elle-même.

Il est possible de constater dans les pièces précédentes l'influence générale des lieux s'exerçant sur les sentiments des acteurs. C'est presque une platitude de répéter les quelques exemples de ce mode d'expression dans *Iphigénie*. A côté de vers comme

Je l'aimois à Lesbos et je l'aime en Aulide

du type si souvent rencontré, nous avons, par répercussion, l'inhérente tristesse d'un rivage non favorisé des dieux gagnant maintenant le héros Achille :

...mais quelque triste image
Que sa gloire à mes yeux montrât sur ce rivage...
Dans la nuit du tombeau j'enfermerai ma honte.

C'est-à-dire que non seulement les événements se diversifient et affectent les caractères selon l'époque et les circonstances dont ils émanent, mais selon le site où ils se passent. Témoin ce vers nostalgique :

Mais les temps sont changés, aussi bien que les lieux...

Nous estimons qu'il vaut mieux, pour le moment, ne pas nous attarder à développer la technique de ces vers, si réminiscents des procédés de l'École Symboliste au dix-neuvième siècle ; nous nous contentons de les signaler ici pour bien préciser la *continuité du genre* chez Racine.

Toutefois, les passages de ce genre sont encore assez communs dans *Iphigénie*. Racine a fait sien le culte du lieu pour sa valeur de transformation émotive. Ainsi

Pour moi, depuis deux jours qu'approchant de ces lieux,
Leur aspect souhaité se découvre à nos yeux.
Je l'attendois partout ; et d'un regard timide
Sans cesse parcourant les chemins de l'Aulide,
Mon cœur pour le chercher voloît loin devant moi...

En effet, bien des vers au cours de la pièce dénotent à quel degré le drame dépend entièrement de l'emplacement. Le titre, si souvent abrégé, est *Iphigénie en Aulide* et non pas *Iphigénie* tout court. Le *spectacle pompeux de ces bords*, et le départ de la flotte grecque toute déployée dans la rade de Chalcis, n'en sont que rehaussés par le site bien connu de la ville de Chalcis, sur un rocher abrupte entre deux baies. Et puis, il y a les 'marécages', toujours ce fameux *marais* que les Grecs appelaient *βαθὺς λιμὴν* et que Racine trouvait à Port-Royal, peut-être même à Paris,² encore sur les bords du Bosphore et, après *Iphigénie*, près de la côte trézénienne où ils assurent le dénouement de *Phèdre*.

D'où a pu lui venir cette prédilection pour les marais et pour ceux qui les habitent, *οἱ περὶ τὰ ἔλα οἰκέοντες*?³ Très probablement, elle provient de la lecture d'Homère. Nous savons que, dans ses *Remarques* sur le Livre III de l'*Odyssée*, Racine disait :

¹ On peut même dire que plus le théâtre racinien repose ses 'fondemens' sur des effets de la nature et moins les précisions topographiques paraissent prendre de place dans les *Préfaces* et les courtes indications scéniques du début de chaque pièce. Dans les *Préfaces* d'*Iphigénie en Aulide* et de *Phèdre*, par exemple, il n'est fait mention en aucune sorte du scénario : est-ce pour 'dérouter' les critiques qui,

comme le dira plus tard Taine, 'ne voient la nature que transformée en jardin'?

² Si, à plusieurs reprises, Racine a parlé des sites entourés de marais, c'est peut-être parce que le public du dix-septième siècle n'y faisait pas vraiment attention en tant qu'élément de la nature extérieure. Le quartier du Marais à Paris et le fameux théâtre étaient devenus des noms acceptés sans pensée par les Parisiens.

³ Hérodote, *Euterpe*, II.

‘ce marais ne peut être autre chose que la mer qui est en effet un assez beau marais’. Ce qui semblerait prouver l’attraction qu’ont exercée sur son esprit la mer et le bord marécageux depuis son jeune âge.

Un seul vers (342)

‘...Ces bois qui du camp semblent cacher l’entrée’

nous fait savoir que le camp se trouvait dans une forêt: premier épisode de la tradition qui fait d’Hippolyte, un être *nourri dans les forêts*, le héros d’un drame grec. Le fait que ces bois *semblaient cacher l’entrée* (quel demi-ton typique!) fournit l’élément d’obscurité—non pas de noir absolu qui est mauvais—nécessaire à la réussite technique de Racine, et prépare la mise en scène de *Phèdre*.

D’autre part, de fortes attaches avec Argos et Mycène (Agamemnon possédant ‘des Grecs la plus riche contrée’) amènent Racine presque à parler avec tendresse de ces villes:

Si son heureux destin
La retient dans Argos ou l’arrête en chemin.

Enfin Racine a voulu que la mer jouât un grand rôle dans l’imagination des acteurs comme dans la sienne. C’est là un nouveau développement. La mer cesse, à partir de cette période de l’évolution de la technique racinienne, d’être comme le Dieu d’*Athalie*, acteur invisible sur la scène, mais va, dans l’imagination théâtrale d’un Racine qui songe aux *περίκτοι* devenir un personnage dédoublé, pour ainsi dire, variable non seulement selon les saisons et les vents, mais aussi selon les dispositions d’esprit. Elle devient ainsi ce que furent les *lieux* dans les tragédies antérieures.

En effet, la mer Egée sera ‘épouvantée’ de voir la flotte grecque mettant voile pour Troie, tandis que, bien loin, en Asie Mineure, l’Hellespont sera ‘blanchissant sous les rames’. Ce n’est pas la première fois que Racine intéresse ainsi la mer aux projets médités par les humains. Dans son *Ode tirée du Psaume XVII* presque rien n’a trait à la nature, si ce n’est de petites digressions, mais ce qui est fort curieux, c’est que ces ‘retouches’ au Psaume sont les seuls sentiments qui ne se trouvent pas dans l’original. Racine s’en sert donc pour communiquer des sentiments qui se répercutent dans *Iphigénie*.

Au devant des pâles victimes
Que poursuit ton glaive perçant
Prête à sortir de ses abîmes
La mer accourt en mugissant
Intéressée à ta vengeance.

Sur certains effets de ces phénomènes, nous aurons à revenir.

LE RIVAGE

Ce mot, qui est presque devenu chez Racine une tournure épique, reste naturellement au premier plan dans *Iphigénie* puisqu’il s’agit de départs projetés et d’arrivées sur des bords incertains. Inutile de revenir ici sur les *Poésies de Port-Royal*, *Andromaque* et *Mithridate*—l’association des rivages et des sentiments, le bord pouvant être ‘heureux’ ou ‘funeste’ suivant le cas. L’Aulide est un rivage qui rend Achille *brûlant*, mais c’est en même temps un bord qui peut devenir funeste à l’occasion:

Et quittez pour jamais un malheureux rivage....

Or, ici il y a du nouveau qui va même jusqu'à suggérer que ces répétitions ne sont pas purement une préciosité que Racine se serait lui-même créée: lorsque les vœux et les sacrifices sont exaucés, à la fin d'*Iphigénie*, le bord reste malheureux: il gémit.

La rive au loin gémit, blanchissante d'écume
tout comme dans l'*Ode* que nous venons de citer.

La mer accourt en mugissant
Intéressée à ta vengeance.

Quelle conclusion tirer de ces citations? Quel rôle 1° dans la pièce et 2° dans le sentiment intime de Racine convient-il d'attribuer au Rivage? Ne fait-il que répercuter, bons ou mauvais, les vœux et les pensées? S'accorde-t-il exactement avec les destinées accomplies? Ou bien ne constitue-t-il qu'une sorte de trait d'union artificiel entre les personnages et la terre dont ils jouent les destinées? Peut-être y a-t-il un peu de tout cela dans l'emploi si fréquent de ce mot. Il faut dire que le rôle de la rive dans *Iphigénie* se trouve un peu mis à l'ombre par celui de la mer et des vents. C'est pourquoi nous aimerions mieux reporter à l'examen de *Phèdre* l'étude de ce facteur important dans les données du théâtre racinien, car dans cette dernière des tragédies dites profanes il est à la fois acteur et centre de la pièce.

LA MER ET LA BLANCHEUR DES VAGUES

Nous avons déjà indiqué à grands traits le rôle de la mer comme force motrice dans cette pièce. L'apostrophe à la mer fait foi, en effet, de sa toute puissance.

Quoi? pour noyer les Grecs et leurs mille vaisseaux
Mer, tu n'ouvriras pas des abîmes nouveaux?
Quoi, lorsque les chassant du port qui les recèle
L'Aulide aura vomé leur flotte criminelle...

Or, chacune des deux mers dont il est question dans *Iphigénie*, l'Egée et l'Hellespont, sont calmes; mais, phénomène extraordinaire pour Racine, poète si méthodique, leur calme ne s'attribue pas à une cause commune. La mer égéenne est calme parce que les vents ne sont pas favorables à Agamemnon.

Certes, nous avons de belles images de la mer tranquille, dignes de certaines strophes du *Lac* de Lamartine:

Le long calme, il est vrai, retarde vos conquêtes...
Il fallut s'arrêter et la rame inutile
Fatigua vainement une mer immobile.

Cette mer, comme Racine le dit, reste 'fermée' à la flotte d'Aulide, mais elle est menaçante. Cela se sent pendant toute la pièce. Il ne s'agit que d'une accalmie temporaire. Le vocabulaire de la première partie de la tragédie est en violent contraste avec une vraie atmosphère de mer d'huile. On parle des 'vents enchaînés sur leurs têtes', d'un 'orage tout prêt à tomber', de 'flots tumultueux s'ouvrant devant nous'; et cet orage, qui gronde sans éclater, est affilié à l'orage psychologique, à la tempête des sentiments. Les personnages du drame, calmes comme la mer en apparence, sont ténébreux, *électrifiés* comme les gros nuages qui les surplombent, pleins de foudre. Achille va-t-il 'céder' à 'cet orage' avant que Clytemnestre ne voie

'...le pur sang du Dieu qui lance le tonnerre'?

C'est que cette inactivité apparente de la mer et des sentiments humains est fausse et trompeuse. Dès les débuts de la pièce, il semblait que

'...tout dort, et l'armée et les vents, et Neptune.'

Mais au vers 839 on sent bien

Neptune et ses vents prêts à nous exaucer...

et

Déjà dans les vaisseaux la voile se déploie
Déjà sur sa parole ils se tournent vers Troie...

L'orage en effet éclate avec la venue des vents sur la mer:

Les vents agitent l'air d'heureux frémissements
Et la mer leur répond par ses mugissements;
La rive au loin gémit, blanchissante d'écume

tout comme on l'avait prévu, lorsqu'on s'imaginait voir

...tout l'Hellespont blanchissant sous nos rames.

Bien au contraire, cependant, le côté troyen a une mer calme, qui ne nous est guère décrite que par le mot '*blanchissant*'. Les petites images que nous laisse entrevoir Racine, ou que nous lisons entre les lignes, indiquent un vrai calme. D'abord, nous avons, malgré ce qu'on en dise, l'impression que 'Troie et les vents' ne 'vont point ensemble'.

'...le ciel protège Troie...'

On sait qu'à votre tête
Les dieux ont d'Iliou attaché la conquête;
Mais on sait que pour prix d'un triomphe si beau,
Ils ont aux champs troyens marqué votre tombeau;
Que votre vie, ailleurs et longue et fortunée
Devant Troie en sa fleur doit être moissonnée...
...les dieux, jusque-là protecteurs de Paris
Ne nous promettent *Troie et les vents* qu'à ce prix.

Enfin c'est la mer qui protégera Troie en engloutissant la flotte dans ses abîmes. Troie reste bien sereine, et le dénouement d'*Iphigénie* ne nous dit pas si ce calme fut brisé...

Résumons-nous sur certains points avant d'attaquer un facteur bien plus important dans *Iphigénie*—les vents.

Le marais, de même que le rivage, à Aulis est mouvementé malgré son apparence calme, alors que, dans l'imagination des héros de la pièce, ils sont calmes et heureux au-delà de l'Egée, en Troade.

Comment distinguer le vrai calme, et quel est son utilité esthétique? Pourquoi Racine veut-il nous donner perpétuellement l'impression d'un monde calme d'au-delà, d'un *mundus ultior*? Souvenons-nous d'un vers de l'*Odyssée* que Racine a commenté:

Ἐσώρεσεν δὲ Θεὸς μεγαλήτεα πόντον

et de la note marginale de la plume de Racine:

Ce vers exprime bien le calme et la tranquillité de la mer.

LA COULEUR BLANCHE

Oui, pour Racine, la mer de l'Hellespont est calme: le verbe *blanchir* qui, à notre avis, est un des mots-clés de toute la philosophie racinienne, ne signifie pas *moutonner* lorsqu'il est appliqué à la mer, dans le sens, par exemple, de l'anglais *a sea of white horses*. L'Hellespont ne moutonne pas de lui-même. Il moutonne à cause des rames des galères grecques et encore est-ce *dans l'imagination des héros*.

L'explication du sentiment racinien nous semble pouvoir résider soit dans les *Commentaires* sur l'Ode I de Pindare :

'Il [Pindare], dit Racine, appelle la mer chenue ou parce que c'est le premier et le plus ancien des éléments, ou à cause que sa continuelle agitation la fait blanchir,' soit d'un souvenir de l'*Iliade* LIV, vii, 86, *πλατὺς Ἑλλήσποντος*, que certains traduisent 'Hellespont salé', et l'idée du blanc proviendrait alors du sel marin, soit d'un autre commentaire marginal sur l'*Odyssee* :

'Il (Homère) appelle le calme blanc, à cause que l'eau paraît blanche quand elle n'est point agitée.'¹

Cette dernière solution, ou même les trois ensemble, peuvent fournir une clef plausible à l'emploi de ce mot qui reparaitra dans *Athalie*.

Quoi qu'il en soit, l'immédiat, le positif (disons : l'emplacement d'*Iphigénie en Aulide*) où il manque un élément d'importance majeure (disons : l'offrande d'une jeune fille aux dieux, un sacrifice d'apaisement destiné à la nature), tout cela contribue à motiver le drame intense que vit Racine, et qui consiste en la recherche d'un état plus simple, toujours lointain, où il n'y aura plus besoin de luttas ou de sacrifices, de sang rouge à couler, mais où règnera une atmosphère calme, ombragée, parce que mal entrevue (disons : l'arrivée en rade de l'Hellespont et de Troie, blancheur de la mer, pureté d'intention garantie par l'apaisement des éléments).

Venons maintenant à ce qui doit nous intéresser particulièrement. Quel rapport peut-il exister entre l'atmosphère de lointain dans les deux tragédies de *Mithridate* et d'*Iphigénie*, à part l'aspect immédiat, topographique, qui en est un des contrastes ?

Se pourrait-il que, dans les désirs de *Mithridate* de se voir, avec sa flotte, en lointain pays et ceux des Grecs de se voir dans l'Hellespont, il y ait un progrès dans l'ordre de l'évolution de la philosophie racinienne ? Certains vers de *Mithridate*, sont bien faits pour dévoiler des horizons d'immensité aux yeux des spectateurs, et là il s'agissait surtout d'aurores et de couchants. Pouvons-nous retrouver la même chose ici ?

Mais oui, dès le premier vers, exprimant le malaise ressenti par Agamemnon, nous voyons ce dernier *devançant* l'aurore de loin. Le demi-jour, pour lui, est un état trop bon pour durer ; aussi fuira-t-il vers le grand jour, vers *cet astre cruel*, le soleil, et vers la fin de la pièce vient la fameuse apostrophe au soleil dont se ressouviendra Goethe :

Et toi, soleil, et toi qui dans cette contrée
Reconnois l'héritier et le vrai fils d'Atrée
Toi qui n'osas du père éclairer le festin
Reculé, ils t'ont appris ce funeste chemin.

Rien de plus fort que ces vers, empreints de tout le vocabulaire naturel dont disposait Racine. Encore une fois, c'est le soleil qui est néfaste. Seul le calme du demi-jour est favorable à la paix intérieure de l'homme.²

¹ Il se peut que Racine ait aimé la couleur blanche de la mer ondoyante, disons *ondulée*, parce que ce fut celle des perruques blanches 'chenues' du dix-septième siècle.

² Nous nous permettons de citer ici, à titre d'information générale, la curieuse remarque du Professeur Horatio Smith, dans *Masters of French Literature* (New York), qui, seul, parmi les critiques de Racine, a reconnu en une certaine mesure le sentiment de la nature dans l'œuvre du poète classique :

'At the very outset of the play, when Agamem-

non awakens his domestic in the quiet of the early dawn, there is a line on the stillness of land and sea which has seemed to an Englishman pompous in a bad sense and which Voltaire so completely of the French tradition has risen to defend :

"Mais tout dort, et l'armée, et les vents, et Neptune."

The Englishman had said he preferred the more homely words in Scene I of *Hamlet* :

"Not a mouse stirring"

Paris and London may both be right.'

D'autre part et comme corollaire à ceci, le complément inévitable n'est pas négligé: c'est la nuit que se font les grandes entreprises humaines, néfastes, pour la plupart, au bien-être du monde ou, en tout cas, entreprises destinées à se composer de malheurs.

Et ce vainqueur [Achille], suivant de près sa renommée
Hier avec la nuit arriva dans l'armée...
Dans la nuit du tombeau j'enfermerai ma honte....

LES VENTS

Quand on considère les divers phénomènes de la nature extérieure qui ont attiré l'attention de Racine au cours de sa carrière littéraire, on ne peut que s'étonner que le vent, facteur dynamique, ait pris dans son œuvre une place si minuscule. Alors que les rives, les champs, les panoramas, les ciels, les océans, les astres ont tous tour à tour fourni des possibilités esthétiques, le vent ne semble point avoir soufflé dans l'atelier racinien. Toutefois, le rôle joué par l'air pur a été mentionné ailleurs par nous, et maintenant la part du vent dans l'*Iphigénie* est suffisamment grande pour compenser des 'lacunes' précédentes. Il convient cependant de passer rapidement en revue les références antérieures à la pièce, ne serait-ce que pour mieux accentuer le rôle tout puissant de l'intervention des vents dans cette tragédie.

M. Masson-Forestier, qui est souvent un peu le disciple de Taine, dirait sans doute que les vents d'*Iphigénie* ne constituent que la réaction logique, quoique tardive, d'un premier environnement à La Ferté Milon et dont le caractère distinctif fut l'âpreté du climat. Pareille hypothèse nous paraît mieux réussir quand il s'agit d'un auteur nettement autobiographique: c'est ainsi qu'on est en droit de déclarer que toute l'œuvre de Charlotte Brontë se ressent du rude climat du Yorkshire.

Cependant, on est parfaitement en droit de reporter au temps de son adolescence la première attraction qu'eut Racine pour les vents, car dès son séjour à Uzès, il est évident que les vents ont déjà, peut-être depuis longtemps, assumé une importance assez analogue à celle qu'ils auront dans *Iphigénie*. Car si, à Uzès, les 'zéphirs'—plutôt que les bourrasques ou le mistral—étaient les bienvenus par le fait qu'ils contrecarraient en quelque sorte les excès de chaleur ou de l'insomnie, dans *Iphigénie* ils le sont à un non moindre degré parce qu'ils dissipent l'air chaud et pesant des délibérations humaines.

Par deux fois, d'ailleurs, dans les œuvres de Racine que nous offre l'édition Mesnard, on peut lire, différemment tournée, la même citation latine sur les vents. Le *Laus Hiemis* est peut-être de l'époque intercalée entre Port-Royal et Uzès: on y lit du Tibulle¹

Quam juvat inmites recubantem audire susurros
Ventorum et somnos, imbre juvante, sequi!

et, en 1661, Racine, écrivant à l'Abbé Le Vasseur, répète plus ou moins la même pensée:

Je goûte tous les plaisirs de la vie solitaire. Excepté cinq ou six heures du jour, je suis tout seul, et je n'entends pas le moindre bruit. Il est vrai que le vent en fait beaucoup, et même jusqu'à faire trembler la maison. Mais il y a un poète qui dit:

O quam jucundum est recubantem audire susurros
Ventorum, et somnos imbre juvante, sequi!

Ainsi, si je voulois, je tirerois ce vent à mon avantage; mais je vous assure que je ne

¹ Tibulle, I, Eleg. I, 45 sq.

m'y accoutume pas, et que ce vent-là m'empêche de dormir toute la nuit, tant qu'il est horrible. Je crois que le poète vouloit parler de ces Zéphirs Flatteurs,

Che dibattendo l' ali
Lusingano il sonno de' mortali.¹

Dans *Iphigénie*, on peut dire que Racine a certainement 'tiré les vents à son avantage'. Des quantités de vers répètent, comme une Chanson de Geste louant son héros, des refrains ayant tous *les vents, les mêmes vents* comme chapelet. Plus exactement, c'est une longue supplication, une vraie kyrielle aux vents.

Examinons la raison pour laquelle les vents durent ainsi frapper l'imagination de Racine. Nous verrons que le site, le complot et le dénouement dépendent entièrement de ce *leitmotiv*.

Le port de Chalcis est unique en Grèce. De chaque côté du grand rocher qui s'avance dans l'estuaire, la marée changeait sept fois par jour. Ce phénomène doit, paraît-il, être attribué à la situation abrupte du rocher et des deux baies, l'une petite et tortueuse, l'autre ronde. De sorte que les variations extraordinaires dans la marée auraient été provoquées par le vent ou, plus précisément, par les soudaines bourrasques venant des montagnes ou de la colline de Mycalessos. Comme conséquence, la vitesse des eaux pouvait atteindre 11 ou 12 km. à l'heure à certains moments.

De cette manière, ne semble-t-il pas que tout s'explique? D'abord le départ d'un port de mer assez reculé au fond, et dont la sortie entraînait, pour une flotte, un voyage presque en sens inverse pour doubler l'extrémité méridionale de l'Eubée; puis l'attente des vents qui, de toute façon, selon les circonstances normales, ne devaient pas tarder; le grandiose départ, mise en route comparable à l'arrivée devant Troie, voiles gonflées, *poupes couronnées*, etc., par l'action des vents. Tout cela, n'est-ce pas, a été longtemps négligé par les critiques d'*Iphigénie*. Racine a tout connu dans l'antiquité qu'il s'approprie jusqu'aux plus petits détails. Mais il faut certainement être au courant des détails 'météorologiques' pour comprendre toute la signification de la nature dans cette pièce; comprendre surtout qu'aucun autre site grec ne pouvait présenter le même intérêt, et conclure que ce n'est pas pour le sacrifice, mais pour les vents, que Racine a écrit *Iphigénie en Aulide*.

Car les vents dirigent tout. Ils sont le premier espoir d'Agamemnon à la pointe du jour. Il tend l'oreille pour attraper 'quelque bruit', signal que ses prières ont été exaucées; mais, hélas! les vents, comme l'armée et comme la mer, sont endormis. Notez bien, ils ne font que *dormir*. C'est là un point important. Pendant aucun instant, les héros ne doutent que les vents soient réellement présents. C'est absolument le rôle de Dieu dans *Athalie*. Il y a là comme une puissance ressentie et respectée; Agamemnon, Clytemnestre, Achille, tous sentent que, derrière les collines, les vents attendent et guettent, et c'est justement cet élément d'inconnu et de mystère qui fait la force de la pièce. C'est comme un *ignotum pro magnifico*. D'ailleurs, tout est asservi aux vents. Les *mille vaisseaux* ne dépendent pas des *lois* du roi: on n'attend qu'une chose seule. Nous ne pouvons nous empêcher de souligner fortement cette singularisation des vents (qui sont placés au bout du premier hémistiché en place forte)

n'attendent que les vents // pour partir sous vos lois.

¹ *La Jérusalem délivrée*, chant XIV, Stance I. Racine a, cette fois encore, un peu modifié la citation:

E i venticelli dibattendo l' ali
Lusingavano il sonno di mortali.

L'acteur s'arrête pour respirer après le grand mot. Deux vers plus loin il est répété de nouveau

Ces vents, depuis trois mois enchaînés sur nos têtes.

Cependant, bientôt se dégagent des sentiments plus complexes. Il y a en quelque sorte concordance entre les vents qui dorment et la flotte immobile. Le vent joue avec les galères pour flatter pendant un moment l'espoir des chefs. On sent presque les marées de Chalcis qui, à longueur de journée, montent et descendent :

Nos vaisseaux par les vents sembloient être appelés...

Le vent qui nous flattoit nous laissa dans le port...

puis, pendant un moment, c'est une des sept mort-eaux :

Il fallut s'arrêter, et la rame inutile

Fatigua vainement une mer immobile.

On dirait que, de son côté, la galère joue, sans le vouloir, avec la marée : 'fatigua vainement...' Mais de combien le jeu des vents est supérieur et plus puissant !

Ainsi, pendant toute la durée des quatre premiers actes, on ne désespère jamais des vents, comme on ne désespère jamais d'une grande marée. Neptune et les vents sont *prêts à nous exaucer* et, aussitôt, la tactique de la marée recommence de plus belle :

Déjà dans les vaisseaux la voile se déploie

Déjà sur sa parole [i.e. celle de Neptune] ils se tournent vers Troie.

Mais dès qu'on présage la conquête d'Ilion, il faut

Du silence des vents demander la cause...

Attendant les vents qui nous sont refusés.

Ainsi l'action de la pièce reste comme suspendue en l'air, comme un ballon qui ne peut naviguer sans vent. L'atmosphère se précise encore : que demande-t-on ?

Je ne demande aux Dieux qu'un vent qui m'y conduise,

ce vent dont on a

prédit l'infaillible retour

et, peu à peu, nous paraît-il, dans l'esprit général des chefs grecs, les vents cessent d'être comme des éléments solitaires, objets de prières spéciales. Ils s'associent à une sorte de volonté supérieure dont ils sont une partie constituante : pareils à des dieux, on les a 'longtemps accusés'. Il eût mieux valu les demander directement aux dieux, du moment que leur retour était *infaillible* (il y a peut-être déjà la force moderne et *personnelle* dans ce mot).

Et enfin ils viennent, ils soufflent, ces vents ! Mais leur caractère est bien lié avec le firmament tout entier : d'abord :

Les Dieux font sur l'autel entendre le tonnerre ;

puis :

Les vents agitent l'air d'heureux frémissements ;

puis, par répercussion, la marée chalcissienne :

Et la mer leur répond par ses mugissements ;

et même, par répercussion de la marée :

La rive au loin gémit....

Ainsi, au cours de cette pièce, à part les dieux avec lesquels ils constituent une sorte de dualité divine, les vents sont bien l'élément le plus fort et le plus puissant, voire même le seul facteur d'importance considérable. La mer et la rive leur sont soumises; ils occasionnent et contrôlent les marées de la baie. A la fin de la pièce, ils portent un nuage. Est-ce celui des derniers moments?

Le soldat étonné [i.e. 'foudroyé'] dit que dans une nue
Jusque sur le bûcher Diane est descendue....

C'est très probable. Mais si l'on est en droit de considérer les vents comme le *dieu impitoyable* d'*Iphigénie* qui *seul a tout conduit*,¹ nulle part Racine n'appelle les vents par des noms de divinités antiques. Ils restent plutôt de purs éléments naturels.

MARCEL CHICOTEAU

HIGHGATE

¹ La thèse que nous suggérons ici rejette un peu dans l'ombre la formation janséniste de Racine au sujet de laquelle tant a été dit. A première vue, certes, on dirait bien que les vents d'*Iphigénie* et le Dieu d'*Athalie* sont intransigeants comme des Jansénistes du dix-septième siècle... Mais la grâce divine n'est pas donnée par le destin aux sacrificateurs, et peut-être pas nécessairement à Joad et Josabeth. C'est par une action volontairement consentie que la rédemption leur est accordée. Ce que

l'on peut dire, néanmoins, c'est que Racine croit à un ordre supérieur de choses qui est distinct des activités humaines, mais auquel l'homme peut atteindre s'il pèse le bon et le mauvais en lui. Les vents d'*Iphigénie* et le temple d'*Athalie* sont des moyens de parvenir au Bien. En les comprenant par étude laborieuse, il semble plutôt que, selon Racine, n'importe quel homme (et non des *élus*) puisse s'élever vers l'ordre supérieur.

A LITTLE-KNOWN PRECURSOR OF BAUDELAIRE. THE 'BOUZINGO' PHILOTHÉE O'NEDDY

In 1829 there flourished in Paris a small group of artists and writers who called themselves Le Petit Cénacle to distinguish themselves from Le Cénacle which met at the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal under the leadership of the librarian, Charles Nodier. These young men—none of whom was more than twenty at the time—met at the studio of the sculptor Jehan du Seigneur, and they gloried in their revolutionary ideas and their eccentricities. To make themselves different from ordinary people they altered the names with which they had been christened to give them an archaic or a foreign flavour. Thus *Jean* became *Jehan*, *Louis Aloysius*, and *Pierre* became *Pétrus*. Sometimes their admiration for Britain was visible in the alteration. Auguste Maquet transformed his name to Augustus MacKeat. At other times the modification was eccentric as well, and Théophile Dondey changed his name, by anagram, to Philothée O'Neddy. Their fashion in dress was as strange as their taste in names. Gautier, in his *Histoire du Romantisme*, has left us a description of most of the members of Le Petit Cénacle. There was Jehan du Seigneur who brushed his hair up from two side partings into a high peak rising above his forehead, to simulate, says Gautier, the flame of genius. In place of a waistcoat he wore a black velvet doublet fitting tightly to his figure and laced at the back; over this a loose jacket with wide velvet revers and a flowing silk tie; he showed no trace of white at his neck, not even a collar. The following year Gautier was to outdo du Seigneur by flaunting, at the *Bataille d'Hernani*, not a black doublet but a crimson one. Baudelaire, in his Dandy phase, was to follow the more sober colouring of du Seigneur.

There was Eugène Déveria, famous even as early as this for his picture *La Naissance d'Henri IV*, a magnificent figure dressed like a Spanish grandee. There was Ourloff in Cossack boots; Bouchardy in his bright blue coat with the gilt buttons like that worn by a Maharajah; the two brother painters who called themselves, one Le Gothic and the other Le Christ, in their sweeping blue cloaks lined with pale pink fastened by big pearl buttons as large as five shilling pieces. There was also Célestin Nanteuil, who was said to look like an archangel who had stepped out of a medieval stained glass window. It is he who has illustrated so many of the delightful editions of romantic works which now fetch such high prices amongst connoisseurs. Then there were, best known to-day, Gerard de Nerval and Théophile Gautier, the former famous already for his translation of *Faust* which had been highly praised by Goethe himself. Gautier, at nineteen, was famous for nothing except his exuberant spirits and his flowing locks.

Amongst all the members of Le Petit Cénacle there was one who had undoubtedly supreme prestige and authority. This was Pétrus Borel, who called himself Le Lycanthrope. In those days it used to be said that when Borel began to publish his works Victor Hugo would need to look to his laurels. In 1829 he was the uncontested leader of the younger generation of writers, and it was to him that Hugo turned—not to Gautier or De Nerval—to organize the campaign for the *Bataille d'Hernani*.

Pétrus Borel, says Gautier, was the living incarnation of the spirit of poetry, and not an ordinary mortal. At times he looked as if he had stepped down from a picture by Velasquez, and he could easily be imagined moving mysteriously

through the streets of Seville in his cloak 'couleur de muraille'. He had a haughty, condescending courtesy that made him different from his contemporaries, and although he was a revolutionary he was never a rough bohemian. It was this aristocratic and disdainful quality in him which attracted Baudelaire when he met him fifteen years later.

Sometimes he wore a red waistcoat—the colour of Polish blood he called it—and a wide-brimmed hat with a bunch of multi-coloured ribbons flowing down behind. But generally he dressed in the severe, well-cut black suit—tight-fitting trousers and a coat buttoned up to the neck showing only a narrow rim of white—which he is wearing in the famous portrait by Boulanger.

His face was serious in expression, far older than his years, of perfect regularity of feature; his skin was of a light olive colour, faintly golden, like the patina on an old painting; his eyes were bright and at the same time they seemed weighted with hidden melancholy; his mouth was of a brilliant red, like a flower Gautier describes it, beneath his moustache, and it possessed the mobility of the mouth of an Oriental. But most remarkable of all was his dark brown beard, a silky beard, faintly perfumed, that framed his face and gave him the appearance of a Sultan from *The Arabian Nights*. There were only two beards in Paris at that time, says Gautier, that of Déveria and that of Borel, but Borel's was the finer, a full beard, an imperial beard, the beard of a leader.

Borel used to affect in his speech a strange and paradoxical manner—a manner later adopted by Baudelaire—and no one ever knew whether he meant seriously what he said. Like Baudelaire he was a brilliant conversationalist, and in 1829 he still enjoyed society; he had not yet begun his lycanthropic baying at the moon. He could, when he was twenty, have posed for the portrait of the perfect Byronic hero, 'l'homme fatal', proud of his good looks, arrogant in his manner, striding along surrounded by a bevy of admiring youths, with his cloak thrown over his shoulder, 'trailing his shadow after him', Gautier calls it, and woe betide the man who trod on it.

After the Revolution of 1830 the members of Le Petit Cénacle, disgusted with the result of the rebellion, prided themselves on their opposition to the new government and to accepted law and order. They then called themselves Les Tartares and later Les Bouzingos. This last name was hurled at them as an insult, but they took it up and accepted it as a compliment. One evening, as they went charging down the boulevards and shrieking 'Nous allons faire du bouzingo! Nous allons faire du bouzingo!¹' the police thought that they were political agitators and arrested the whole band. In the police report and in the papers they were called insultingly 'les bouzingos'. To be arrested was a common experience amongst 'les bouzingos'. Another evening, as they were returning late from some 'orgy', they were shouting 'Vive Bouchardy! Vive Bouchardy!' and the police thought that it was 'Vive Charles X!' they were crying. This was just after the July Revolution and such a cry would be treasonable, so they were all arrested again and had to spend the night in prison. Gerard de Nerval has related this experience in *Sainte-Pélagie*.

At this time Borel was living in a street called, most appropriately, La Rue d'Enfer, and there he gave one of the most famous 'orgies' of the eighteen-thirties. At this party the ices were served in skulls and the punch was so strong that many of the guests were knocked out and their unconscious bodies were taken down to the basement, where a temporary First Aid Post had been set up, for treatment.

¹ *Bouzingo* = noise.

The 'galop infernal' brought the festivities to a close. As the dance room was considered too small, the rout ended up in the street outside, in the early hours of the morning, with the dancers in fancy dress and mostly intoxicated.

These were 'les bouzings', and a good picture of the group is that given by Philothée O'Neddy in the poem *Pandaemonium* of the collection *Feu et Flamme*.

The first work published by a member of the gang was *Les Rhapsodies* by Pétrus Borel in 1831. This collection of poems was intended to be the expression of bitterness and revolt, and its aims are set forth in the preface with a violence that is very striking. The poems are intended to be the scum and the slag of the poet's nature, but they do not fulfil the claims of the preface and, with a few exceptions, they are mild and weak by contrast, not very different from many of the poems appearing in the romantic *Keepsakes* of the time. The preface alone is violent and daring and gives a new conception of poetry. Two years later, however, a collection of poems, *Feu et Flamme* by Philothée O'Neddy, carried out more fully the ideas set forth in the preface to *Les Rhapsodies*. *Feu et Flamme* is the most violent work produced by 'les bouzings'. The poems of Philothée O'Neddy are indeed the scum and the slag of the poet; they are the explosion of a young writer who has not yet learnt discipline. O'Neddy, far more than Borel, seems to have 'broyé du fer rouge', yet he never enjoyed the same fame and notoriety as did Le Lycanthrope. Perhaps this was because his personality was not so flamboyantly picturesque and he had not the same pride and arrogance. The young take their contemporaries at their own valuation, and Borel's valuation of himself was very high.

Who then was this Philothée O'Neddy who appeared for so short a time on the horizon of literature and then faded away so quickly?

Philothée O'Neddy began life with the more ordinary name of Théophile Dondey. He was born in Paris on 30 January 1811. His father was a minor civil servant, employed at the Ministry of Finance and, although the family was not rich, young Dondey suffered no hardships in his youth. While still a pupil at the Lycée Louis le Grand he came under the influence of *Le Globe*, a paper whose republican and liberal views attracted the younger and more progressive writers between 1824 and 1830.

On leaving school O'Neddy gravitated to Le Petit Cénacle and became one of the planets revolving round the sun of Pétrus Borel. Like his friends and contemporaries he fought at the *Bataille d'Hernani* and was carried away by enthusiasm for the Revolution of 1830. Like them also he was bitterly disappointed with the results of the revolt and was left with the same desire for destruction.

Gautier has given us, in his *Histoire du Romantisme*, a portrait of O'Neddy at the time of 'les bouzings'. He was so dark skinned as to seem almost like a mulatto, but, as a violent contrast, he had thick fair woolly hair and extraordinarily blue eyes, very beautiful eyes made more dreamy and mysterious by their astigmatism. They were so short-sighted as sometimes to appear unseeing, and he used to say that he had to keep his glasses on when he was asleep in order to be able to see his dreams. The general impression that he gave was that of a fair Moor, and his friends used to call him 'the blond Othello'.

O'Neddy wrote the poems published under the title *Feu et Flamme* in 1829 and 1830, but they were not printed until 1833 though the collection was ready at the time of the Revolution. He lost his father in the cholera epidemic of the spring of 1832, and with him the small modicum of financial security he had hitherto enjoyed. This put an end to his plans of being 'un homme de lettres'. His father died after twenty-nine years of service when he was on the point of retiring but,

since he had died before retiring age, his wife had no pension. O'Neddy was then left as sole support of his widowed mother and unmarried sister. He did not shrink from shouldering the burden and he became a civil servant as his father had been. The Ministry of Finance appointed him to the same post which his father had held, and he remained in it until he reached retiring age.

His literary friends were disappointed in him and dropped him. They may have thought it unworthy of a 'bouzingo', unworthy of the creator of *Feu et Flamme*, to settle down so quickly, and to have been moved by the bourgeois virtue of a sense of responsibility towards his family would have seemed to them incomprehensible and despicable.

He now became a civil servant in a black suit, with a stiff collar and neat tie. He determined, however, to publish the poems that he had composed when he was eighteen and nineteen. Perhaps he thought that their fame might later permit him to rely solely on his writings for a living. Victor Hugo was known to make large sums of money from his poetry.

The poems were printed by his cousin, Dondey-Dupré, and the collection appeared in August 1833. It is a very beautiful little book elegantly printed on good paper, with a frontispiece by Célestin Nanteuil. The edition was limited to three hundred copies and it was almost entirely paid for by the author himself. To-day this slim little volume is considered one of the gems of the Romantic movement, one of those most eagerly sought after by bibliophiles and treasured when found. It is one of the most elegant little books of the time.

The title, *Feu et Flamme*, was intended to startle and to arouse curiosity, as was the preface.

Comme vous je méprise de toute la hauteur de mon âme l'ordre social, [wrote O'Neddy] et surtout l'ordre politique qui en est l'excrément; — comme vous, je me moque des anciennistes et de l'académie; — comme vous je me pose incrédule et froid devant la magniloquence et les oripeaux des religions de la terre; — comme vous je n'ai de pieux élancements que vers la Poésie, cette sœur jumelle de Dieu.

Daring also are the names of the separate poems: *Pandaemonium*, *Nécropolis*, *Succube*, *Incantation*, *Spleen*, *Néuralgie* and so forth. Borel's titles in *Les Rhapsodies* seem mild and innocent in comparison. Yet, in spite of this, the book aroused little interest. Its fire and flame spluttered out without leaving sufficient light to illuminate the name of their author, and he sank down into the obscurity and oblivion of his government office.

La Revue Encyclopédique did him the honour of attacking him on the score of his offensiveness to standard art and conventional morality. The critic raised his voice in protest against the empty and dangerous ideas which he claimed were being propagated in certain quarters on the plea of the freedom of poetry.

O'Neddy tried to secure the support of Chateaubriand and sent him a copy of his book. But 'le père du Romantisme', now a saddened and ageing man, was horrified at the violence and extravagance of this unknown descendant of his. 'René' had grown old and now preached to his children. He told his young follower not to profane the great gifts that Heaven had bestowed on him and to respect Christianity and tradition.

The strongest impression that the reader receives from *Feu et Flamme* is one of constraint and anguish, which is not met to such an extent until the poetry of Baudelaire. The poems contain a bitterness and a *spleen* that surpasses anything in the writings of Borel. Baudelaire, as a young man, may have modelled his personality largely on that of Le Lycanthrope, but it seems as if it were from *Feu et*

Flamme, rather than from *Les Rhapsodies*, that he drew much of the substance of his first manner. He has never mentioned in his writings the name of O'Neddy, nor has he ever referred to *Feu et Flamme*. Perhaps this may have been because he never had occasion to do so. It was the death of Pétrus Borel in 1859, in Algeria, that gave him the pretext for his article on Le Lycanthrope, which he printed on 15 July 1861 in *La Revue Fantaisiste*. O'Neddy, at the time of Baudelaire's death, was still vegetating in his government office, forgotten by everyone. Yet the similarity of some of Baudelaire's poetry to that of O'Neddy is remarkable, for there are lines and turns of phrase that are sometimes almost identical in both poets. 'Le terrible jamais vibre comme un tocsin' from *Névalgie* is a line that Baudelaire might have written and the following couplet from *Nécropolis*:

Plus de rages d'amour ! le cœur stagnant et morne,
Ne se sent plus broyé sous la dent du remords,

is reminiscent of the couplet from *L'Irréparable* of Baudelaire:

L'Irréparable ronge avec sa dent maudite
Notre âme piteux monument.

While a further couplet from *Nécropolis*

Ose à la fois être le juge,
La victime et l'exécuteur,

is like one from *L'Héautontimorouménos* of Baudelaire:

Je suis les membres et la roue,
Et la victime et le bourreau !

And was it in the lines from *Amour* of Philothée O'Neddy, 'Puis-je assez te chérir, mon ange, mon idole', and later

Mets tes yeux sur mes yeux. Donne à ma lèvre, donne
Ta lèvre séraphique, ô ma blanche Madone !

that Baudelaire found his own lines 'Je suis l'Ange gardien, la Muse, la Madone', and again

A l'Ange, à l'idole immortelle
Salut en l'immortalité.

At eighteen Philothée O'Neddy expresses the same *ennui* that Baudelaire was to express twenty years later when he was twenty-five, and his efforts compare favourably with those of his older and famous successor. He writes in a poem called *Spleen*:

Oh ! combien de mes jours le cercle monotone
Effare ma pensée et d'ennuis la couronne !
Que faire de mon âme et de ses saints transports,
Dans cet air étouffant qui pèse sur la ville,
Au milieu d'une foule insouciant et vile,
Où dort l'enthousiasme, où tous les cœurs sont morts !

And the poem ends:

Pleure ! il faut te résoudre à languir dans les villes.
— Adieu l'enthousiasme. — En des travaux serviles
On t'ensevelira, comme en un froid linceul.
Ah ! pleure — mais tout bas, de peur que l'ironie
De misère et d'orgueil n'accuse ton génie.
— Et point d'amis encore — il te faut pleurer seul.

Compare this with the sequence of *Spleen* poems by Baudelaire and particularly with the one which begins

Quand le ciel bas et lourd pèse comme un couvercle
Sur l'esprit gémissant en proie aux longs ennuis,
Et que de l'horizon embrassant tout le cercle
Il nous verse un jour plus triste que les nuits;

and which ends

— Et de longs corbillards, sans tambour ni musique,
Défilent lentement dans mon âme; l'Espoir,
Vaincu, pleure, et l'Angoisse atroce, despotique,
Sur mon crâne incliné plante son drapeau noir.

There is in O'Neddy a Baudelairean love of Satanism, of the occult, an affection for love potions, for pacts with the devil, for necromancy:

Non, non! Je creuserais les sciences occultes;
Je m'en irais, la nuit, par des sites incultes,
Et là, me raillant du Seigneur,
Je tourbillonnerais dans la magie infâme,
J'évoquerais le Diable... et je vendrais mon âme
Pour quelques mille ans de bonheur.
Pour arsenal j'aurais l'élémentaire empire;
Le goblin, le djinn, le dragon, le vampire,
Viendraient tous me saluer roi,
Je prendrais à l'Enfer ses plus riches phosphores,
Et métamorphosant mes yeux en météores,
Partout je darderais l'effroi.

There is in O'Neddy also the blending of good and evil, the contrast between *spleen* and *idéal* which is so characteristic a feature of Baudelaire's work. The following lines from *Delta* might have been written by Baudelaire in his youth:

C'est qu'à la fois je tiens du démon et de l'ange:
C'est que, par un caprice intraduisible, étrange,
— Que tu concevras toi,
Mais qui susciterait des sots la pitié grave, —
Je veux être à la fois ton maître et ton esclave,
Ton vassal et ton roi!

Love for O'Neddy was the same torture and battle that it was for Baudelaire, and *Eros* strikes a strange note in the midst of the romantic effusions of 1829:

Ha! cette vision me tue! — A chaque fibre,
La volupté me mord, dans ma veine qui vibre
Je sens comme un bitume aux corrodants ruisseaux;
Une robe de feu qui torture et dévore
Comme un vêtement du perfide Centaure,
Se colle à ma chair, à mes os!
Et je râle et je crie, et vers ton beau fantôme
Je tords mes bras chargés d'un électrique arôme.
Vois dis-je, vois mon corps se calciner pour toi!
Ne veux-tu pas donner un terme à mes supplices!
"Oh! viens! Dans un chaos d'orageuses délices,
Viens t'anéantir avec moi!
— Démence: — il n'entend pas, le fantôme ironique!
Volupté, que lui fait ton étreinte harmonique?
Il fuit: — Mais le Désir, gnome au souffle fiévreux,
Reste, et toujours, toujours, ce railleur taciturne,
Sur mon âme et mes sens, veufs du repos nocturne,
Distille un philtre sulfureux.

Amour is more truly Baudelairian in style as well as inspiration:

Laisse, fée aux yeux noirs, laisse mon corps jaloux,
Comme un serpent lascif, s'étendre à tes genoux !
Lorsque la vénusté de son éclat m'obombre,
Dieu seul de mes bonheurs pourrait dire le nombre.
Laisse ma tête en feu se serrant contre toi,
Carresser follement ta robe; laisse-moi
Sous l'amour de tes yeux qui me trempent de flamme,
Respirer comme un vague et saisissant dictame,
Que je boive à pleins bords l'oubli des mauvais jours !
Ma reine, dis-moi bien que tu seras toujours,
Dans les sables brûlans de ma vie agitée,
Mon ombreuse oasis et ma coupe enchantée !

Only the third and fourth lines would seem out of place in a poem by Baudelaire. The image of the lover compared to a serpent, or to a cluster of worms, is a favourite one with the early Baudelaire; so, too, is the description of the opiate powers of his mistress's perfume. Some lines recall *Le Léthé* of Baudelaire, particularly the following verse of that poem:

Dans tes jupons remplis de ton parfum
Ensevelir ma tête endolorie,
Et respirer, comme une fleur flétrie,
Le doux relent de mon amour défunt,

while the last eight lines recall very forcibly *La Chevelure* of Baudelaire, the poem which ends

N'es-tu pas l'oasis où je rêve, et la gourde
Où je hume à longs traits le vin du souvenir ?

Baudelaire saw death as 'le but de la vie, le seul espoir' as 'l'elixir qui donne le cœur de marcher jusqu'au soir':

C'est la clarté vibrante à notre horizon noir;
C'est l'auberge fameuse inscrite sur le livre,
Où l'on pourra manger, et dormir, et s'asseoir.

For O'Neddy also death was the only refuge, the only peace. He wrote in *Nécropolis*:

Sous la tombe muette oh ! comme on dort tranquille !
Sans changer de posture, on peut, dans cet asile,
Des replis du linceul débarassant sa main,
L'unir aux doigts poudreux du squelette voisin.
Il est doux de sentir des racines vivaces
Coudre à ses ossements leurs nœuds et leurs rosaces,
D'entendre les hurrahs du vent qui courbe et rompt
Des arbustes plantés au-dessus de son front.
C'est un ravissement quand la rosée amie,
Diamantant le sein de la côte endormie,
A travers le velours d'un gazon jeune et doux,
Bien humide et bien froid arrive jusqu'à vous.
Là silence complet, *far niente* sans borne.
Plus de rages d'amour: le cœur stagnant et morne,
Ne se sent plus broyé sous la dent du remords.
— Certes, l'on est heureux dans les villes de mort !

In *Névralgie* he sees death as a mistress for whom he passionately longs:

Mon œil s'arrêterait ardent sur son œil vide,
Je l'emprisonnerais dans une étreinte avide,
Et, le sang tout en feu, j'oserais apposer
Sur sa bouche de glace un délicat baiser !

O'Neddy was as capable as was Baudelaire of contemplation of other visions than those of *spleen*, death and decay. He has poems similar in inspiration to *La Vie Antérieure* and *L'Invitation au Voyage* of Baudelaire, where the poet escapes into an exotic land where everything is beautiful and worthy of being loved. One of these poems is *Rhodomontade*:

Aux mers de l'Orient, dans une île embaumée,
 Mes sylphes porteraient ma pâle bien-aimée,
 Et lui bâtiraient un séjour
 Bien plus miraculeux, bien autrement splendide
 Que celui qu'habitaient, dans la molle Atlantide,
 Le roi de féerie et de sa cour.

Amour, enthousiasme, étude, poésie!
 C'est là qu'en votre extase, océan d'ambroisie,
 Se noieraient nos âmes de feu!
 C'est là que je saurais, fort d'un génie étrange,
 Dans la création d'un bonheur sans mélange,
 Être plus artiste que Dieu!!!

For final example of O'Neddy's talent and inspiration there is *Succube* which contains a whole nosegay of *fleurs du mal*:

Je rêvais, l'autre nuit, qu'aux splendeurs des orages,
 Sur le parquet mouvant d'un salon de nuages,
 De terreur et d'amour puissamment tourmenté,
 Avec une lascive et svelte Bohémienne,
 Dans une valse aérienne,
 Ivre et fou j'étais emporté.

Comme mon bras cerclait sa taille fantastique!
 D'un sein que le velours comprimait élastique
 Oh! comme j'aspirais les irritans parfums!
 Et que j'étais heureux, lorsque, brusque et sauvage,
 Le vent roulait sur mon visage
 Les gerbes de ses cheveux bruns!

Certes il y avait bonheur et poésie
 Dans le spasme infernal, la chaude frénésie,
 L'émoi luxurieux, le corrodant languir,
 Qui mordaient, harcelaient nos âmes remuées,
 En tournoyant ainsi sur les molles nuées
 Que sous nos pieds nous sentions fuir.

Oh! pitié! — je me meurs. — Pitié! ma blanche fée!
 Disais-je d'une voix électrique, étouffée.
 Regarde. — Tout mon corps palpite incandescent. —
 Viens, viens, montons plus haut, montons dans une étoile.
 Et là, que ta beauté s'abandonne sans voile
 A ma fougue d'adolescent!

Un fou rire la prit. . .rire désharmonique,
 Digne de s'éployer au banquet satanique.
 J'eus le frisson, mes dents jetèrent des strideurs. —
 Puis, soudain, plus de fée à lubrique toilette!
 Plus rien dans mes bras qu'un squelette
 M'étalant toutes ses hideurs!

Oh! comme en ton amour se complâit ta valseuse!
 Murmurait sa voix rauque. Et sa poitrine osseuse
 Pantelait de désir, râlait de volupté.
 Et puis toujours, toujours, de nuage en nuage,
 Avec elle au fort de l'orage,
 Je bondissais épouvanté!

Pour me débarrasser de sa luxure avide,
 Je luttais vainement dans la brume livide.
 De ses bras anguleux l'enlacement profond
 S'incrustait dans mes chairs ruisselantes de fièvre,
 Et les baisers aigus de sa bouche sans lèvre
 M'incisaient la joue et le front.

Comme pour un adieu, dans ma sombre détresse,
 Je criai tout à coup le nom de ma maîtresse...
 Quel trésor que ce nom ! quel divin talisman !
 Le spectre me lâcha pour s'enfuir d'orbe en orbe.
 — Et joyeux du réveil, je touchai mon théorbe,
 Mon théorbe de nécroman.

Amongst lines that are reminiscent of *Les Fleurs du Mal* there are lines which Baudelaire would never have written, and he would certainly have omitted the last verse which comes as an anti-climax. Yet the poem is very similar in inspiration to his *Métamorphoses du Vampire* in which, after describing the beauties of a woman for whom 'les anges se damneraient', he continues:

Quand elle eut de mes os sucé toute la moelle,
 Et que languissamment je me tournai vers elle
 Pour lui rendre un baiser d'amour, je ne vis plus
 Qu'une outre aux flancs gluants, toute pleine de pus !
 Je fermai les deux yeux, dans froide épouvante,
 Et quand je les rouvris à la clarté vivante,
 A mes côtés, au lieu d'un mannequin puissant
 Qui semblait avoir fait provision de sang,
 Tremblaient confusément des débris de squelette,
 Qui d'eux-mêmes rendaient le cri d'une girouette
 Ou d'une enseigne, au bout d'une tringle de fer,
 Que balance le vent pendant les nuits d'hiver.

It is not intended to exaggerate the debt that Baudelaire may owe to the works of Philothée O'Neddy. *Feu et Flamme* seems to have been written by a young and clumsy Baudelaire—not that clumsiness is always absent even from Baudelaire's mature work—but it must not be forgotten that O'Neddy was only eighteen and nineteen when he composed the poems and that they are superior to those we have from Baudelaire's pen at the same age. It is not intended either to claim that O'Neddy was a great poet and that he deserves a high place in the Pantheon of writers, but only to suggest that if the collection *Feu et Flamme* were signed by Baudelaire we should think it a remarkable achievement for a youth who had only just left school, and we should see in it the seeds and the promise of his future genius. It is intended also to show that what is generally called Baudelairean psychology and atmosphere already existed in a marked form as early as 1830.

The civil service killed O'Neddy as a poet, and there is little to say of him during the forty odd years that followed the publication of *Feu et Flamme*. He dropped the name O'Neddy and returned to his real name, Dondey de Santeney, and under that name he published stories of no great value in various periodicals and a short novel in the romantic vein in 1842 called *L'Anneau Enchanté, Roman de Chevalerie*. For three months in 1843 he was dramatic critic to *La Patrie*, but resigned because the editor refused to publish the flamboyant article he wrote in praise of *Les Burgraves* of Victor Hugo for the first night. For some months, later in the year, he was dramatic critic to *Le Courrier Français*, but the reason of his resignation—or dismissal—is not known. He continued to write poetry, intermittently, until within ten years of his death, but only four sonnets were printed during his lifetime.

The remaining poems were published posthumously by a school friend—Ernest Havet—with an introduction in 1877, and it is from this introduction that we obtain the main facts of his life. This poetry is of meagre literary interest or value. Havet tells us that the most significant event of his life was a passionate love affair which is the inspiration of *Tablettes Amoureuses*; unfortunately it inspired him only to sentimentality, triviality and banality. Amongst all these poetic effusions—*Ballades*, *Elegies*, *Tablettes Amoureuses*, *Vision d'un Mort Vivant*, *Vellétés Philosophiques*—there is nothing that fulfils the promise of *Feu et Flamme*, and only one poem, the sonnet he wrote as a *post-scriptum* to *Vellétés Philosophiques*, the last poem he ever wrote, is of any value or interest:

Or qu'est-ce que le VRAI? Le Vrai c'est le malheur;
 Il souffle, et l'heur vaincu s'éteint, vaine apparence;
 Ses pourvoyeurs constants, le désir, l'espérance,
 Sous leur flamme nous font mûrir pour la douleur.
 Le Vrai, c'est l'incertain; le Vrai, c'est l'ignorance;
 C'est le tâtonnement dans l'ombre et dans l'erreur;
 C'est un concert de fête avec un fond d'horreur;
 C'est le neutre, l'oubli, le froid, l'indifférence.
 C'est le pauvre insulté jusque dans sa vertu;
 C'est au pied des tyrans l'homme libre abattu;
 C'est d'un amour trahi l'angoisse inexprimable.
 C'est Peut-être, A quoi bon? Qu'importe? Je ne sai,
 Pourquoi? Comment? Où donc? Voilà, voilà le Vrai.
 Ah! le VRAI n'est pas beau, le VRAI n'est pas aimable!

After 1846 nothing more was heard of Philothée O'Neddy in the literary world for twenty years until the 'reprise' of *Hernani* in 1867. Auguste Vacquerie, the brother of Victor Hugo's son-in-law, relates how a respectable elderly bourgeois came to the offices of the organizing committee to obtain a ticket for the first night. When asked for his name and credentials he gave his name as Philothée O'Neddy, famous at the *Bataille d'Hernani* nearly forty years before, and Vacquerie hastened to grant his request, thinking it right that the man who had struck a blow on the day of the battle should now be a witness of the final victory.

Théophile Dondey lived out the days of his life in quiet obscurity in Paris with his widowed mother and his spinster sister. He never married. His mother died in 1861 after being bedridden with paralysis for five years. After her death he continued to live with his elderly sister. She did not make up to him for the loss of his mother whom he had loved better than any other human being. 'Le vide qui s'est fait pour ma sœur et pour moi ne sera pas comblé', he wrote to his friend Havet. 'Nous pouvons bien nous donner la main par dessus; nous le faisons; mais c'est tout.' Dondey himself was largely to blame for the lack of intimacy between himself and his sister, for the 'je ne sais quoi de tacite, de neutre et de morne' between them, since he had always kept her away from any contact with real life.

Dès la première jeunesse [he wrote to Havet] il m'a été facile de prévoir que ma sœur ne se marierait pas. Je me suis résolu dès lors à contribuer de tout mon pouvoir à rendre son célibat calme et digne. Je pensais, et je pense encore, qu'il est à propos, pour la dignité et la tranquillité du douloureux état de vieille fille, de maintenir autour de lui quelque chose de claustral. J'y tâchais donc, en ne laissant arriver à elle, dans les discours et dans les livres, que rarement et avec grand choix, les trop magnifiques puissances de la Vie, même les plus hautes et les plus pures.

It was not to be wondered at if there was eventually between them nothing but 'l'ombre et le silence'. She tried to find consolation in painting, but art was a

disappointment to her, as it had been to her brother who had written some years before:

Triste Muse ! il nous sied—sans plainte ni témoins—
D'attendre la vieillesse et la mort—dans mon coin !

In 1873 he was struck down by paralysis and was nursed with great devotion by his sister until his death. Illness is said to have changed the peaceful law-abiding bourgeois and he became gloomy, bitter and violent in his views. Maybe it released the hidden fires which he had kept damped down since his youth, but now they burned only with a destructive flame which gave neither heat nor light. Those who came into contact with him said that his character had suddenly become radically changed—perhaps it had only been stripped of its covering of respectability and convention.

He died in 1875 in the sixty-fifth year of his life.

ENID STARKIE

OXFORD

TRANSLATION INTO GERMAN IN THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY

In fifteenth-century Germany, Latin (the language of Church, University, and men of letters) played a more important role than German, and must therefore be borne in mind as a formative influence in German literature in that century. Following the example of the authors of the Italian Renaissance, who aimed at the revival and restoration of Classical Latin,¹ German writers determined to write medieval Latin no longer, but rather to aim at evolving a style modelled on Classical examples. In spite of their endeavours,² however, they were so unsuccessful in this attempt that, when Melanchthon reviewed this period, he criticized them strongly. Ignorant as they were of Latin, he wrote in 1539, they could not even imagine what it meant to write well.³ The changed attitude towards Latin style can best be illustrated by confronting the opinions of Nicolaus of Cues and Jacob Wimpheling. In 1433 Nicolaus of Cues openly admits that as a German his Latin style is not so cultivated as that of the Italian writers.⁴ But in 1492 Jacob Wimpheling, reviewing the development of Latin style, regrets that in his time authors who wrote a 'humble' and not an 'elegant' style were no longer read.⁵

It is difficult to believe that this movement, so clearly expressed in Latin, should not have affected German style as well, especially when it is remembered that admiration for Latin is expressed side by side with complaints about the clumsiness of German. When comparing the two languages, critics are struck by the crudeness of German speech and its lack of inflexion.⁶ The application of the rules of Latin rhetoric and in particular the imitation of Latin grammar, syntax, and expression seemed the simplest way to overcome such deficiencies. Thus the door was opened to the introduction of the absolute use of the participle, gerund, accusative and infinitive, etc. The beginnings of this can certainly be traced farther back than the fifteenth century when it was prevalent.⁷ The influence of Latin grammar on German writers was very great,⁸ as can be seen from Jacob Wimpheling's judgement on the use of the durative tense in German dialects. Wimpheling's reason

¹ See, for example, the Preface of Laurentius Valla, *De Linguae Latinae Elegantia*.

² Cf., for example, Herman Schedel, *Briefwechsel* 1452-1478, ed. P. Joachimsohn (Bibl. Litterar. Ver. Stuttgart, cxvii, 1893), passim, especially Epp. 35, 37 of 1460. For Luder's attitude see Wattenbach, 'Peter Luder, der erste humanistische Lehrer in Heidelberg' (*Zeitschr. Gesch. Oberrheins*, xxii, 1869), pp. 41 ff., and P. Joachimsohn, 'Frühhumanismus in Schwaben' (*Württemberg. Vierteljahrshefte f. Landesgeschichte*, N.F., v, 1896), p. 265.

³ *Decl. De Vita Rodolphi Agricola* (ed. C. G. Bretschneider, *Corpus Reformatorum*, xi, p. 440).

⁴ *De Concordantia Catholica* (ed. G. Kallen, *Opera Omnia*, civ), Preface.

⁵ Printed in Thirtemius, *Catalogus illustrium virorum*... (quoted here from the edition of 1495). Earlier writers were 'horridi. impoliti. rudes et informes' in their style. 'Quapropter

si nostrates aliqui non accurato quidem sed doctrinali quotidianoque sermone usi fuere: non aspernandi. Namque satis erat eis ita loqui, ut in rebus honestis intelligerentur.'

⁶ See, for example, the letter by Johann of Saaz on *Der Ackermann aus Böhmen*. For the latest edition of this letter and for a short bibliography see H. Rupprich, *Die Frühzeit des Humanismus und der Renaissance in Deutschland*, pp. 110-11, 310-11, 301-2.

⁷ See Johann von Neumarkt, Ep. 29 (of ? 1357-63), ed. P. Piur, in *Vom Mittelalter zur Reformation*, viii, pp. 51-2.

⁸ The imitation of Latin style in German has not yet been examined. Some remarks on this subject can be found in A. Hübner, 'Deutsches Mittelalter und italienische Renaissance im *Ackermann aus Böhmen*' (*Zeitschr. f. Deutschkunde*, LI, 1937, pp. 230-2).

for rejecting it is not only that it was not used everywhere in Germany, but also that it did not correspond to Latin.¹

These stylistic tendencies culminate in the word-for-word translation of Nicolas von Wyle and his followers who proclaimed the principle of translating each Latin word by a German one, thus preserving Latin idioms and syntax in German. In 1478 Wyle published his *Translationen*,² a collection of eighteen translations made from 1461 onwards. As explained in the preface to this work (written in 1478), he intended to give in his translations³ examples of all the rules of Latin rhetoric, and thus his purpose was the same as that expressed in Johann von Saaz' letter on his *Der Akermann aus Böhmen*.

Wyle's preface, however, being a justification of the word-for-word method of translation, is of special interest. As is customary in the fifteenth century, Wyle quotes authorities to support his views. These quotations, though concealing the clearness of Wyle's argument and hiding his own personality, name as his sources the humanists L. Bruni Aretino, Aeneas Sylvius, and Gregor Heimbürg,⁴ and not earlier writers of German prose showing the same tendencies, such as Heinrich von Mügeln or Johann von Saaz. L. Bruni and Aeneas Sylvius maintained, as Wyle states, that the student of rhetoric should only read books which satisfy the highest exigencies of rhetoric, for by reading authors who write elegantly the reader will learn to acquire their style; but by reading those who write clumsily the reader's mind will be adversely affected.⁵ The acceptance of this instruction and its application to German made it necessary to formulate certain rules by means of which the quality of German style could be determined. The superiority of Latin over German and the existence of a firm and acknowledged structure of Latin rhetoric made it possible and even natural to subject the German language to Latin rules. This meant for Wyle that a word-for-word translation, as the most exact imitation of Latin style, must necessarily contain all the good qualities of the Latin original text. Wyle points out that in this he follows Gregor Heimbürg, who held that almost all the rules of rhetoric could be usefully applied to German,⁶ and that an exact translation from Latin would produce the best German style possible.⁷

It seems strange that Bruni's stylistic rules, which were directed against the medieval word-for-word translators,⁸ were themselves used in such a way as to be the theoretical basis for a word-for-word translation.⁹ This phenomenon can be explained only if it is recognized that Wyle, under the influence of Heimbürg,

¹ Wimpeling's letter, written in 1503, is published by W. Crecelius (*Alemannia*, xii, 1884, p. 45).

² Ed. A. von Keller (Bibl. Litterar. Ver. Stuttgart, LVII), 1861.

³ Loc. cit., p. 10, line 12.

⁴ Loc. cit., p. 8, 24 (Leonardus Aretino); p. 8, 35 (Aeneas Sylvius); p. 9, 7 (Gregor Heimbürg).

⁵ L. Bruni, *De studiis et litteris*, ed. Baron (*Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters und der Renaissance*, i, 1928, p. 7); Wyle, loc. cit., p. 8, 33.

⁶ Loc. cit., p. 10, 25. For Heimbürg's stylistic tendencies see P. Joachimsohn, 'Frühhumanismus...', loc. cit., pp. 81-2.

⁷ Loc. cit., p. 9, 5 ff.

⁸ See Bruni, loc. cit., pp. 77, 83, 95, 103 ff. However, Bruni's translations were attacked and

the word-for-word method was defended. For this controversy see A. Birkenmajer, 'Der Streit des Alonso von Cartagena mit Leonardo Bruni Aretino' (*Vermischte Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Mittelalterlichen Philosophie*, 1922, esp. p. 175), and M. Grabmann, 'Eine unge-druckte Verteidigungsschrift der scholastischen Uebersetzung der Nikomachischen Ethik gegenüber dem Humanisten Leonardo Bruno (*Mittelalterliches Geistesleben*, 1926, pp. 440 ff.). The view of Alonso von Cartagena (written c. 1430) is similar to that of Cusa and Wimpeling (see above, p. 368, note 5).

⁹ It is difficult to assert Wyle's knowledge of Bruni's writing. He quotes *De studiis et litteris* (see above, note 5) and knows him through his translation of Aeneas Sylvius (loc. cit., p. 209, 15 ff.).

transferred Bruni's thoughts on style to German. By closely imitating Latin subtlety of style, expression, and rhetoric, he hoped to be able to refine the undeveloped German language. In this way he must have hoped to fulfil the task given to him by Aeneas Sylvius, namely, to restore style and rhetoric in Germany.¹

Everything was subjected to this aim. 'German was to be remodelled according to Latin standards. This tendency, so severely criticized by modern scholars,² was considered by Wyle to be of special advantage. For it could enable the reader (Wyle was a teacher and wrote his first translations for the benefit of his pupils)³ to learn not only the art of writing 'ornate' German but also to understand and learn Latin, through a comparison of the translation and the original text.⁴ Wyle's intention to further the knowledge of Latin reflected the current thought of his time. It was indeed necessary to learn German style (and this Wyle taught), but for a man of culture Latin was indispensable.

However, Wyle's method of translation was open to reproach, inasmuch as his style could not easily be understood. It is on this score that Wyle answers his critics, critics whom he never names but only mentions generally, and always in the plural.⁵ He points out that he is able to write a clear style⁶ when he translates according to sense, a method which might be justified by reference to Horace. But Wyle limits this method to the paraphrase of Latin expressions in such cases when equivalent German words are wanting.⁷ He allows this deviation from the strict rules of the word-for-word method, but for the sake of preserving Latin rhetoric he prefers to follow the Latin text closely even to the detriment of clearness of style.⁸ These words are clearly directed against those, who, disregarding rhetorical exigencies, advocated rendering sense for sense, and not word for word, and who aimed at being clearly understood.⁹

Wyle's words leave the reader in no doubt about their implication, for his interpretation of Horace (written in 1478) is borrowed from Steinhöwel, one of the translators according to sense, who uses the same verses in 1473. Steinhöwel's rendering of these lines of Horace:

nec verbo verbum curabis reddere fidus
interpres...¹⁰

(verses often quoted in this connexion since St Jerome first used them in the Middle Ages) differs in two respects from all the earlier interpretations known to me: (1) Steinhöwel, using Horace's words to the greatest advantage for justifying his own method of translation, says: 'Faithful translator, do not render word for word!' instead of the correct meaning: 'You should be unlike a slavish translator—

¹ Aeneas Sylvius, Ep. 119 (ed. of Norimberg of 1481). Cf. the similar remark in Ep. 120, directed to Heimburg.

² P. Joachimsohn, loc. cit., p. 88, '...un-deutscher Bevorzugung der Passivkonstruktionen....' Similar statements by B. Strauss, *Der Uebersetzer Nicolaus von Wyle* (Palaestra, cxviii, 1922), p. 237; K. Burdach, 'Die Einigung der neuhochdeutschen Schriftsprache', *Vorspiel*, I, part 13, note 1; W. Stammer, *Von der Mystik zum Barock*, 1400-1600, pp. 32-3. It is easy for a modern critic who knows the development of the German language, to call this development 'natural'. But such an attitude perverts

the issue of the stylistic questions prevailing in the fifteenth century.

³ Loc. cit., pp. 9, 14 ff.; 349, 4 ff.

⁴ Loc. cit., p. 364, 23.

⁵ A list of the passages where Wyle speaks of his critics (*schumpfierer*) is given by Strauss, loc. cit., p. 7, note 1.

⁶ Loc. cit., pp. 7, 29 ff.

⁷ Loc. cit., p. 8, 14; cf. p. 350, 5 ff.

⁸ Loc. cit., p. 8, 22 ff.

⁹ For examples see below p. 372, note 3. For the different schools of translators see P. Joachimsohn, loc. cit., pp. 118 ff.

¹⁰ Horace, *De Arte Poetica*, 133-4.

you should not render word for word.'¹ (2) Steinhöwel makes the addition of 'sense for sense' to the phrase 'word for word' found in Horace. This is in agreement with many German translators who justified their method with the injunction 'not word for word, but sense for sense'.² They did not mention that their wording has its origin in a letter of St Jerome in which these words of Horace are interpreted.³ Steinhöwel, probably influenced by them, used their precept; finding part of it in Horace,⁴ he ascribed the whole phrase to the Roman poet, though his quotation, owing to the addition of 'but sense for sense', is a mixture of Horace and St Jerome.

Wyle's translation of Horace is identical with that of Steinhöwel, and his dependence on him is obvious. However, while Steinhöwel uses Horace for the justification of his method of translation, Wyle accepts this interpretation, but attempts to set limits to the application of Horace's advice. Thus, Wyle's conclusion is different from, and even in opposition to, Steinhöwel. It is, therefore, most probable that Wyle's words refer to a discussion between these two schools of translation. The probability of such a discussion is the more obvious as the co-existence of these

¹ Steinhöwel, *Speculum Vitae* (Augsburg, c. 1475) fol. 7 v.: 'Darynne ich dem spruch Oracij nachuolget hab. Lutend du getrüwer tolmetsch nit wellest allweg eyn wort gegen wort transferieren. sonder gebürt sich vnd ist gnüg ausz eynem synne eyne andern synne. doch gleicher mainung zesetzen. das ich dann in diser meynen translacion auch an etlichen orten getan vnd ettwann etliche wort hab gelassen czü loffen oder abgebrochen czü merer verstantnusz den lesenden menschen disz büches. dass ich mich will entschuldigt seyn ausz dem yetz gemelten spruch oracy flacci.'

Wyle, loc. cit., p. 8, 5: 'Ich weisz ouch das mir so wyter vszlouf hieryn elroupt gewesen wer nâch dem vnd oracius flaccus in syner alten poetry (als du weist) schrybet. daz ein getrüwer tolmetsch vnd transferyrer. nit sorgfellig sin söl. ein yedes wort gegen eim andern wort zeuerglychē sunder sey gnüg: dz zū zyten ein gantzer sinn gegen eim andern synn verglychet werd: als ich dañ oft uñd vil in disen nâchfolgenden translätzen an andern orten getân han vnd etweñ genötiget tûn müst.' (Quoted from the fifteenth-century edition in the Bodleian Library.)

Joachimsohn, loc. cit., pp. 118 and 123, note 2, denies any connexion between the two writers because of the difference of style. K. Drescher (in his edition of Steinhöwel's translation of Boccaccio, *De Claris Mulieribus*, Bibl. Litterar. Ver. Stuttgart, ccv, 1895, p. xxx, note 1) has observed Wyle's dependence on Steinhöwel. Neither Joachimsohn nor Drescher has noticed that both writers misinterpreted Horace.

² See below, p. 372, note 3.

³ St Jerome, *Ep.* 57.5.5. (ed. I. Hilberg, *Corp. Script. Eccl. Latin*, LV): 'ego non solum fateor, sed libera uoce profiteor me in interpretatione Graecorum... non uerbum e uerbo, sed sensum exprimere de sensu.' For the influence of Horace, *A.P.*, 133-4, until the ninth century, see W. Schwarz, 'The meaning of *fidus interpres* in

medieval translation' (*Journ. Theolog. Studies*, XLV, 1944, pp. 73 ff.).

It is doubtful if Steinhöwel or the other translators knew that St Jerome was the ultimate source of their words: In 1500 Erasmus of Rotterdam complains that St Jerome's letters were not known (*Ep.* ed. P. S. Allen, I, p. 332). The following quotations of St Jerome, *Ep.* 57 are known to me: (1) Georg von Peuterbach in his *Positio sive determinatio de arte oratoria sive poetica* of 1458 (ed. H. Rupprich (loc. cit., p. 206, lines 8-10) who has not recognized Peuterbach's source). It is, however, difficult to decide if Peuterbach, who does not name his source, uses St Jerome, *Ep.* 57.5.8 (i.e. the sentences immediately following the above words) or St Jerome, *Eusebii Pamphili Chronic. Canonicon* (ed. J. K. Fotheringham, 1923, p. 2^a). (2) The above sentence is cited and the author's name mentioned by Heinrich von Mügeln in his translation of *Valerius Maximus*, a work written in 1369, but printed in 1489, i.e. after the publication of Steinhöwel's and Wyle's works. (For the reading of Mügeln's text, see F. Wenzlau, 'Zweigliedrigkeit in der deutschen Prosa des XV. und XVI. Jahrhunderts', in *Hermæa*, IV, 1906, p. 17). St Jerome's *Epp.* were in Herman Schedel's library (see Stauber-Hartig, 'Die Schedelsche Bibliothek', in *Studien und Darstellungen aus dem Gebiet der Geschichte*, VI, Hefte 2-3, 1908, pp. 128, 130). Schedel mentions *Ep.* 22 in 1465 and the *Epp.* generally in 1466 (*Briefwechsel*, loc. cit., pp. 135, 167).

⁴ P. Joachimsohn, loc. cit., p. 119, was the first to recognize St Jerome as ultimate source; yet he also mentions Petrarch, *Griselda* (published in Ulm in 1473), as source (p. 123 and note 2). In Petrarch's preface, Horace, *A.P.*, 133-4 is quoted without St Jerome's additions. It may possibly be that Steinhöwel was influenced by this preface to name the Latin poet, but Petrarch's quotation could not be the reason for Steinhöwel's wording.

two divergent conceptions of translation was bound to involve a review of their respective merits.

If this explanation of Steinhöwel's and Wyle's words is correct, it is possible to understand a sentence in the preface of the anonymous translator of *Belial* (publ. c. 1472/3) who stresses the necessity of rendering according to the sense because of the different usages of the languages. For, he points out, if the reader does not understand the translator, he often misses the real meaning.¹ This sentence makes sense only if it is regarded as being directed against those whose translations cannot be understood, i.e. either Wyle whose authorship of such works was assumed,² or his followers. Wyle obviously had to answer such a charge. His reply is contained in the preface to his *Translationen*.

None of those who translated according to sense has written a special treatise about his method, and remarks on this subject are, as far as is known to me, limited to the statement that they do not intend to translate word for word, but sense for sense,³ in order to be easily understood.⁴ It is, however, possible to draw from these remarks certain conclusions about their attitude towards the development of German style. The anonymous translator of *Belial* goes beyond the statements of his fellow-translators when he stresses his intention of following the spoken language of the people.⁵ While this observation may possibly (though not necessarily) mean that this translator was aware of the fundamental difference between Latin and German, the other translators, who stress as their principle the aim to be easily understood, do not exclude the possibility of imitating Latin as long as the clearness of their style is not affected. From this point of view it is not strange that Steinhöwel's attitude towards the word-for-word translation should not be com-

¹ The whole passage of *Belial* (publ. Johannes Baemler, Augsburg, c. 1472-3; a modern edition is wanting) is: 'Ouch will ich nit vast darauff achten / das ich daz gegenwürtig büch nit geleich nach den lateinischen worten in teütsch wölle schreyben / wann ich will demnach stellen / daz ich ein yeglichen syn also und mit sölichen worten schreib als man den selben syn gewonlich in teutsch redt. Als geschriben ist daz man die heiligen geschrift in yeglicher sprach reden sol nach der sprach eygner gewonheyt / wan es mag ein syn in einer rede gewonlich geredt werden / in einer andern sprach wär das vngewonlich ze reden. Vnd darumb wenn man den dultmätschen nit merkt / so würt der waren synne dick gefällt.' As these sentences clearly indicate, the translator does not follow the word-for-word method of translation. Nevertheless, the words of S. Stintzing (*Geschichte der populären Literatur des römisch-kanonischen Rechts in Deutschland am Ende des fünfzehnten und am Anfang des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts*, 1867, p. 278), that either Wyle or Albrecht von Eyb (a translator according to sense) has translated this work, is repeated by D. Heubach ('Der *Belial*. Kolorierte Federzeichnungen aus einer Handschrift des XV. Jahrhunderts', 1927, in *Studien zur Deutschen Kunstgeschichte*, CCL, p. 7) and by Schwerin (in *Verfasserlexikon*, ed. W. Stammler, s.v. *Belial*, col. 190).

² Wyle (loc. cit., p. 11, 35-p. 12, 4) denies

the authorship of a translation of Boethius which could not be understood.

³ A list of five authors who use these words in six different works is given by W. Stammler, 'Zur Sprachgeschichte des XV. und XVI. Jahrhunderts' (*Festgabe Gustav Ehrismann*, 1925, p. 176). Stammler's quotations do not seem sufficient for the foundation of his view. The following references have to be added to Stammler's list: Translation of Theramo Paladium, *Belial* (anonymous) (c. 1472-3) (fol. 2r.); Albrecht von Eyb, *Spiegel der Sitten* (written in 1474, publ. in 1511), fol. Ciiiir. (publ. M. Herrmann in *Schriften zur germanischen Philologie*, 4-5, 1890); Heinrich von Mügeln, translation of *Valerius Maximus* (written in 1369, printed in 1489); in Latin it is found in Joannes Ulicus Surgant, *Manuale curatorum predicandi prebens modum* (Basle, 1503, p. 40r./v.); possibly in an anonymous translation of Ps.—St Jerome, *Epp.* (of 1464) (*Anzeiger für deutsches Altertum* vi, 1880, p. 316).

⁴ Albrecht von Eyb, *Spiegel der Sitten*: 'vnuerstentlich—am verstentlichisten'; *Belial*: 'gewonlich in teütsch'; Steinhöwel, *Speculum Vitae*, Preface: 'czü merer verstantnusz'; Joseph Gruenpeck von Burckhawsen, *Von dem bösen Franzos* (Augsburg, 1496): 'zu mer verstantnusz'.

⁵ For the text see above, note 1.

pletely negative. He calls his own style 'humble' and 'simple',¹ probably in contrast to Wyle's 'ornate' language.² Though his 'simple' style was good for the translation proper, he preferred to use the 'ornate' style in his prefaces where he imitates Latin construction.³ It may be suggested that he thought the 'simple' style not elaborate enough for the aristocratic patrons to whom his works were dedicated; for the German language used in their chancelleries, the *Kanzleistil*, was not 'simple', but 'ornate'. This style, as is generally believed, took its origin from Latin and is strongly influenced by it. Steinhöwel, it seems, wished his prefaces to be a display of 'ornate' style that would please his patrons, and thus he preferred to use Latinisms which were nearer to the *Kanzleistil* than the 'simple' and 'humble' languages of the translations.

The suggested existence of the two styles in fifteenth-century Germany makes Wyle's adherence to the word-for-word method of translation more understandable than has been realized hitherto. Wyle, as a town clerk, used the *Kanzleistil* in official documents. Therefore he taught this style and developed it to its utmost limits, namely, in the closest possible imitation of Latin.

Thus the theory of translation in the fifteenth century plays a significant part in the stylistic tendencies of this period. To those who translated according to sense belongs the merit of having gone back to the living language. But this brought them into opposition to the rhetorical aims of their time. This was their weakness, for they could apparently not turn their principle into a system, while the word-for-word translators could use the preponderance of Latin as well as the fixed rules of that language for the creation of a theoretical foundation of their method.

W. SCHWARZ

LONDON

¹ 'schlecht', 'grob': see Steinhöwel, Preface to his *Aesop* (1477-8), ed. H. Oesterley (Bibl. Litterar. Ver. Stuttgart, cxvii, 1873, p. 5); id., *De Claris Mulieribus* (c. 1473), ed. K. Drescher, ibid., ccv, 1895, p. 17.

² 'güt', 'zierlich' in contrast to 'grob',

'unzierlich', see Wyle, loc. cit., p. 8, 32-3; cf. p. 9, 5 ff.; 10, 24 ff. Cf. 'humilis' and 'ornatus' as expressions used for the characterization of style.

³ This was first seen by Joachimsohn, loc. cit., p. 123.

GISLI SÚRSSON AND HIS POETRY: TRADITIONS AND INFLUENCES

Among the most popular of the family sagas are *Gunnlaugs Saga*¹ and *Gisla Saga Súrssonar*.² Their popularity, especially in the case of *Gunnlaugs Saga*, has been even greater in foreign countries than it has in Iceland. The reason for this is fundamentally the same in each case. It is not because they are typical examples of the saga literature, but because they are not. *Gunnlaugs Saga* and *Gisla Saga* have both been strongly influenced by literatures of another kind.

In *Gunnlaugs Saga* the extent and sources of this influence are not obscure. Although it is cast in the conventional form of a family saga, it shows the influence of foreign taste and thought. This may be seen in its treatment of the love-motive, in the chivalry of Gunnlaugr, and even more clearly in the conduct of the heroine, Helga fagra. She is not a woman whom most saga writers would admire. As she sits passively gazing into the embroidered cloak of her dead lover, at the end of the saga, Helga reminds us of Isabella gazing at the Pot of Basil.

Helga is less forcible than the more classical heroines of the Icelandic sagas. She may be contrasted with Hildigunnr in *Njáls Saga*.³ Just as Helga preserved Gunnlaugr's cloak, so Hildigunnr preserved the cloak in which her husband had been slain, and in it she wrapped his clotted blood. But Hildigunnr preserved the blood-stained garment, not to indulge her emotions, but to incite her husband's relatives to vengeance. This was Hildigunnr's purpose when she cast the cloak, crackling with dried blood, over the shoulders of her kinsman, Flosi.

It is plain that the author of *Gunnlaugs Saga* modelled his taste largely on the standards of Europe. Possibly he had studied foreign romances in Latin or French, or even in German, though it seems more probable that these reached him in Icelandic or Norwegian versions, the *Riddara Sögur*. It is chiefly the continental taste of its author which has made *Gunnlaugs Saga* agreeable to those trained to appreciate the medieval and post-medieval literature of Europe. For them, the detached formalism of *Víga-Glúms Saga* is too rigid; the disparaging cynicism of *Ljósvetninga Saga* is too severe.

*Gisla Saga*⁴ is certainly greater as an artistic achievement than *Gunnlaugs Saga*.

¹ The text of *Gunnlaugs Saga* has been printed about twenty-five times, and the saga has been printed in translation about sixty times. The translations include Polish, Czech, Finnish and Faeroese versions. *Gunnlaugs Saga* has inspired some notable literary works, including John Masefield's *Daffodil Fields* (Collected Poems, 1932, pp. 253 ff.).

² The popularity of *Gisla Saga* has not been so great as that of *Gunnlaugs Saga*, but it has been published in translation at least twenty times. The translations include seven in German and one in Polish. *Gisla Saga* has inspired literary works, e.g. B. H. Barmby, *Gisli Súrsson, a drama* (London, 1900), and Maurice Hewlett, *The Outlaw* (London, 1919). The Saga has formed the subject of numerous essays and monographs, some of which will be mentioned below.

³ *Brennu-Njáls saga*, ed. Finnur Jónsson, Halle, 1908, Ch. cxvi.

⁴ References to the prose of *Gisla Saga* apply,

unless otherwise specified, to Benedikt Sveinsson's edition (Reykjavík, 1922), in which the Shorter and Longer versions are both printed in full. References apply to the Shorter version unless otherwise stated. I number the strophes attributed to Gisli according to Finnur Jónsson, *Den norsk-islandske Skjaldedigtning* (1912-15) A, I pp. 101-9, and B, I pp. 96-104. Other useful editions of the saga are those of Konráð Gíslason (Copenhagen, 1849), of Finnur Jónsson (Halle, 1903) and of Finnur Jónsson (Copenhagen, 1929). The latter has not been available to me while preparing this paper. On the relations between the Shorter and Longer versions of the Saga see Finnur Jónsson, *Gisla Saga* (1903), pp. xxii-xxvii; Finnur Jónsson, *Den oldnorske og oldislandske Litteraturs Historie*, II, 1923, pp. 451 ff.; Gudbrand Vigfússon and F. York Powell, *Origines Islandicae*, II, 1905, pp. 188 f.; B. M. Olsen, *Um íslendinga sögur*, Reykjavík, 1937-39, pp. 198 ff.

Nevertheless, it is apparent that the author of *Gísli Saga* has not modelled his taste exclusively on earlier family sagas, and that influences other than they have been at work. This may be seen when Gísli is compared with other outlaws whose lives the saga writers relate. For example, Grettir Ásmundarson remained an outlaw for nearly twenty years because he was self-willed and headstrong, and altogether ill-adapted to the social conditions of the age in which he lived. Gísli was made an outlaw because he slew his sister's husband, Þorgrímr. In this deed, Gísli had fulfilled the duty of avenging his friend and sworn brother Vésteinn, whom Þorgrímr had slain secretly. Sworn brotherhood, undertaken at will, was among the most binding of human ties. For Gísli, vengeance for Vésteinn was a sacred duty. Consequently, in the suffering which he endured because of it, Gísli resembled a Christian martyr, and he himself seemed to realize this. Gísli's brother, Þorkell, from whom he had the right to expect support, forsook him, and he became an outcast. But, unlike most outlaws, Gísli is not in any way an unsocial or anti-social man. He remained bound to society chiefly through his wife, Auðr, to whom he had an emotional, sentimental devotion. In this, Gísli may again be contrasted with Grettir. Love motives played small part in Grettir's life. Grettir's chief contacts with society were through his blood-relatives, especially his mother and his brother, Illugi. Grettir is more characteristically an Icelandic hero than Gísli.

Most family sagas describe the relations between one man and another. Several of them show how one man rises above those around him. Sometimes this is because, like Hrafnkell, he has greater will power than the others, or, like Snorri goði, he is more cunning, or, like Guðmundr ríki, he is more ruthless and vindictive. Several sagas describe human friendship. *Njáls Saga* is an outstanding example. The characters of Njáll and Gunnarr were complementary, and each of them benefited from this mutual friendship. One was straightforward, brave and physically well-endowed, but rash. The other was wise, prudent and learned, but not physically a strong man.

Gísli Saga is concerned with human relations, too, but it does not treat them as most family sagas do. The author is not primarily interested in what his heroes do, nor even in what they think, but in what they feel. His chief concern is with the emotions.

In the early chapters of *Gísli Saga*, the most striking feature is Gísli's friendship with his brother-in-law, Vésteinn. Gísli and Vésteinn travel abroad together (Chs. VII-VIII). In Denmark they are brought into touch with Christian teachers, and are influenced by Christian ways of life. Gísli returns to Iceland earlier than Vésteinn. Before they parted, Gísli cunningly fashioned a coin, which could be divided into two parts, one to be carried by his sworn brother and the other by himself. He persuaded Vésteinn to promise that he would never again leave Iceland without his consent.

Much of the saga describes the mutual love of Gísli and his wife, Auðr, the sister of Vésteinn. The loyalty of Auðr to her husband is emphasized in many chapters, as is the tragedy of their enforced separation during the days when Gísli lived in hiding as an outlaw.

Gísli's relations with his brother and sister, Þorkell and Þórdís, are of particular interest, and are used to disclose the hero's character. Þorkell and Þórdís are remarkably similar, and Gísli loves them both in a way which they do not deserve. More than once, in his early years, Gísli had risked his life to defend Þórdís from the shaming advances of disreputable suitors (Ch. II). But Þórdís did not repay this solicitude. She married Þorgrímr, whom Gísli slew, and she afterwards married

Þorgrím's brother, Þorkr. When she learned that Gísli had slain her first husband, she denounced him to Þorkr (Ch. XIX).

When Gísli speaks of his sister's disloyalty he uses a plaintive tone which is unusual in the hero of a family saga. He once says:

ok þóttumsk ek eigi þess verðr frá henni, því at ek þykkjumsk þat lýst hafa nokkurum sinnum, at mér hefir eigi hennar óvirðing betri þótt en sjálfs míns; hefi ek stundum lagt líf mitt í háská fyrir hennar sakir, en hún hefir nú gefit mér dauðaráð. (Ch. XIX.)

Gísli's brother, Þorkell, is one of those whom the saga describes best. He is a weak and ungenerous man, vain, foppish and lazy. It is perhaps because he is himself so ineffectual that he chooses noticeably forceful characters for his friends. These include Þórdís's husband, Þorgrím, and her viking suitor Bárðr, both of whom Gísli slew. The bad company which Þorkell kept damaged his relations with Gísli, as is apparent already in Ch. II. Þorkell's vanity led him to take an inactive part in the murder of Vésteinn, Gísli's foster-brother. In spite of Þorkell's weaknesses, Gísli appears to be deeply attached to him. It is told how concerned Gísli was about Þorkell's happiness (Ch. IX), and how grieved he was when he parted from him (Ch. XXIII). Þorkell was not ill-disposed towards Gísli, and was ready to help him in his distress, but only so long as he ran no risk himself. Gísli reproaches his brother for his lack of magnanimity in much the same bitter tone as he uses when he speaks of Þórdís. On one occasion he says: *Ok munda ek eigi þér svá svara, sem þú svarar mér nú, ok eigi heldr gera* (Ch. XIX), and, on another: *Nú þykkisk þú öllum fótum í etu standa ok vera vinr margra hefðingja ok uggr nú ekki at þér; en ek em sekr, ok hefi ek mikinn fjandskap margra manna...* (Ch. XXIV).

Subsidiary relationships, and the sentiments of the minor characters are also described in some detail. Several times the author shows how much Auðr loved her brother, Vésteinn (Ch. X). In Ch. XIV he describes Auðr's grief at Vésteinn's death.

Ch. IX is among the most remarkable in the saga. It is told there how Ásgerðr, the wife of Þorkell, and Auðr, the wife of Gísli, accuse each other of unfaithfulness to their respective husbands. Ásgerðr admits, according to the Longer version (Ch. XIV), that she loved Vésteinn more than her husband, though she knew that this love could never be expressed. Þorkell overheard this conversation. His vanity was injured and his jealousy was roused. It was on this account that Þorgrím slew Vésteinn at the instigation of Þorkell. At first we merely suspect Þorkell's part in this murder. It is not until Ch. XXVIII that all doubts are removed. In that chapter it is told how the young sons of Vésteinn slew Þorkell.

The whole tragedy of Gísli's life develops from Ch. IX. Gísli slew his brother-in-law, Þorgrím, to avenge his sworn brother, Vésteinn (Ch. XVI). This deed, which Gísli committed in fulfilment of his duty, led to his outlawry and death.

The episode described in Ch. IX, when Ásgerðr and Auðr quarrel in their apartment, has been compared with the scene in the Burgundian story, when the rival heroines Brynhildr and Guðrún quarrel in the river. Both incidents appear in themselves to be trivial. They provoke jealousy and lead to slaughter and catastrophe.

The emotional situations are sometimes described with a stylistic tenseness, or emphasis, such as is seldom found in the historical prose of Iceland. In Ch. XIV Þorkell questions Gísli about Auðr's grief for Vésteinn's death. He twice uses the same words: *Hversu bersk Auðr af um bróður dauðann? Hvárt grætr hon mjök?* As Vésteinn rides to his death at Hóll, he is warned by three people, whom he encounters on his way, of the dangers which await him. Each of them uses the same words: *Ver(tu) varr um þik* (Ch. XII).

Sometimes the prose of the saga seems to show the influence of poetic style. In Ch. ix, Þorkell speaks in such a way that it is hard to say whether he is using prose or verse: *Heyr undr mikit, heyr orlygi, heyr mál mikit, heyr manns bana eins eða fleiri*. In Ch. xviii, Gísli gazes at Þorgrímr's howe and discloses, in a cryptic strophe, that he had slain him. The strophe is introduced, in the Shorter text, with the words: *Gísli kvað þá visu, er æva skyldi*. The word *æva* is archaic, and is hardly ever found in historical prose. It is preserved in poetic diction, and is especially common in heroic poetry. The phrase *æva skyldi* is also found in *Völundarkviða* (41).¹ The proverb *sér æ gjöf til gjalda* is used in *Gísli Saga* (Ch. xv) in much the same form as it is in the *Hávamál* (145).²

Poetical tendencies in the prose of *Gísli Saga* appear so frequently that there is little need to call attention to them. This tendency is combined with an interest in nature, which is also unusual in Icelandic prose. The following passage, describing the witch Auðbjörg, will serve as a typical example:

Veðr var kalt úti, ok logn ok heiðríkt. Hon gengr nokkurum sinnum andsælis um húsín ok viðrar í allar ættir ok setr upp nasirnar. En við þessa hennar meðferð þá tók veðrit at skipask, ok gerir á fjúk mikit ok eftir þat þey, ok brestr flóð í hliðinni, ok hleypr snæskriða á bœ Bergs, ok fá þar tólf menn bana, ok sér enn merki jarðfallsins í dag. (Ch. xviii.)

It has been rightly said that, while Icelandic poetry is more poetical than other poetry, Icelandic prose is more prosaic. *Gísli Saga* is one of the few historical sagas to which this sharp distinction does not apply.

Just as the story of *Gísli Saga* and the prose in which it is told differ from those of other family sagas, so the strophes in *Gísli Saga* differ from those which other sagas preserve. The saga attributes 36 strophes to its hero. Like the saga itself, most of these are concerned with the emotions, especially with love, sorrow, and apprehension. Such themes are not usually the subjects of scaldic verse. Probably the complicated metrical form of scaldic poetry did not readily lend itself to subjects of this kind. Scaldic poetry was better suited to objective, visual description. It tended to be concrete and picturesque. It appeals to the mind, as jewelry appeals to the eye, for its brilliance and workmanship.

In str. 3 Gísli expresses his grief at Vésteinn's death and alludes to the intimacy of their friendship. He says:

komskat maðr á miðli
mín né hans at víni.

'no one could come between us, as we sat drinking our wine.'

In str. 4 the poet describes Auðr's grief at the death of her brother, Vésteinn. At first Auðr maintained her self-control, and wept only in secret:

Hylr á laun und líni,
linnvengis, skap kvinna,
Gríðar leggsk ór góðum,
Gefn, él kerum svefna.

'The gold-adorned goddess (Auðr) hides her woman's temper beneath the veil, while her tears flow from the fair cups of sleep.'³

¹ Ed. G. Neckel, *Edda*, i, Heidelberg, 1927, p. 119.

² Ed. G. Neckel, *Edda*, p. 40.

³ For alternative interpretations of these difficult lines see Finnur Jónsson, *Skjaldedigtning* B, i, 96; E. A. Kock, *Notiones Norroenae* (Lund, 1923-), §§ 346, 1938; K. Reichardt, *Studien zu den Skalden* (Leipzig, 1928), pp. 187-8. My interpretation bears some resemblance to

that of Jón Þorkelsson, *Skýringar á visum í Gísli Sögu* (Reykjavík, 1873), p. 3.

The chief difficulty is in the interpretation of *Gríðar él*. I take this as a kenning, though possibly a defective one, meaning 'shower of the giantess, tears', cf. *Gríðar byrr*, *tröllkvenna vindr* 'spirit, emotion' (cf. R. Meissner, *Die Kenningar der Skalden*, Bonn, 1921, pp. 138-9).

In str. 5 Auðr conceals her tears no longer:

Hrynja lætr af hvítum
hvarmskógi Gná bógar
hrauns fylvinga; hyljar
hlátrs bann í kné svanna.

'The bracelet-bearing goddess let the nuts (tears) fall from the fair forest of her eyelids (lashes); the enemies of laughter pour down into the knees of the woman.'¹

This rich description of the weeping Auðr is unique in the scaldic poetry of the family sagas. But comparable passages may be found in the heroic poetry. Unlike scaldic poetry, many of the heroic lays are concerned chiefly with the great emotions, love, sorrow and fear. Among the most intensely emotional of the heroic lays are those of the Burgundian cycle, especially the First and Second Lays of Guðrún (*Guð. I* and *Guð. II*) and *Sigurðarkviða en skamma*. The characters whose emotions are most fully described in these lays are Brynhildr and Guðrún. The weeping Auðr of *Gísli Saga* is reminiscent of Guðrún Gjúkadóttir, rather than of any heroine in the family sagas.

In *Guð. I* the heroine is described sitting beside the dead body of Sigurðr. Guðrún does not weep at first, but, when the sheet is withdrawn and the body is exposed, her tears fall fast:

	hlýr roðnaði
en regns dropi	rann niðr um kné.
Þá grét Guðrún	Gjúka dóttir,
svá at tár flugu	tresk í gognum,
ok gullu við	gæss í túni (str. 15-16). ²

It has long been recognized that some of the strophes assigned to Gísli are influenced by lays of the *Edda*, and particularly by those of the Burgundian cycle.³ This influence is plainly evident in str. 9, where the poet alludes directly to Guðrún Gjúkadóttir. There is no other strophe in the whole of scaldic poetry in which so direct an allusion is made to heroic legend.

The subject of str. 9 is Þórdís, Gísli's sister. In str. 8 Gísli had told Þórdís that it was he who had slain her husband, Þorgrímr. Þórdís reported this news to Þorkr, whom she had married after Þorgrímr's death. Þorkr was the brother of Þorgrímr, and was, therefore, obliged to avenge him.

These circumstances lead Gísli to contrast the unstable character of his sister with the unshakable loyalty of the Burgundian heroine, for whom the blood-tie was stronger than that of marriage. It is related in *Atlakviða*, *Guð. II*, and in some other sources, how Guðrún slew her husband Atli and her own sons in revenge for her brothers, Gunnarr and Högni. Guðrún had no greater reason to love her brothers than Þórdís had to love Gísli. Gunnarr and Högni had caused the death of Guðrún's first husband, Sigurðr, just as Gísli had caused Þorgrímr's death.

Þórdís was a more complex character than Guðrún, and it was partly for that reason that she was less constant. After she had learned that Gísli had slain Þorgrímr, she could no longer observe all the duties of loyalty which society expected of her. She was faced with a hard choice. She could either hold her peace, and shirk the duty of avenging Þorgrímr, in which case she would offend Þorkr, or else she could denounce her brother, ignoring the blood-tie. Unlike Guðrún,

¹ Cf. E. A. Kock, op. cit. § 348. For another interpretation see Finnur Jónsson, *Skjaldedigtning B*, p. 97.

² Ed. G. Neckel, *Edda*, p. 199.

³ E.g. Gudbrand Vigfússon, and F. York Powell, *Corpus Poeticum Boreale*, Oxford, 1883, II, p. 331. Cf. notes infra.

the real Germanic heroine, Þórdís chose the second course. This was why Gísli contrasted Þórdís with Guðrún in str. 9:

Gatat sál fasta systir
sveiga mín at eiga
gætnar Gjúka dóttur,
Guðrúnar; hugtúnnum.
Þá er log—Sága loegis
lét sinn-af hug stinnum
svá rak snjallra bræðra
Sör-Freyja—ver deyja.

'My inconstant sister had not the firm heart of wise Guðrún, Gjúki's daughter, in her breast.—For that gold-adorned goddess, the necklace-bearer (Guðrún) caused her husband's death. Thus did Guðrún stoutly avenge her valiant brothers.'¹

The choice which Þórdís made was followed by remorse, which was inevitable in one so vacillating as she. No more is said of her until the end of the saga, but she is not forgotten. It is told in Ch. xxxvii how the assassin, Eyjólf, came to Þorkr and Þórdís to tell them of Gísli's death. Þorkr rejoiced at the news, and told Þórdís to prepare sumptuous food to welcome the assassin. But Þórdís said that she could only weep for her brother's death. Later in the same evening, Þórdís seized the sword, which had been taken from Gísli, and tried to stab the assassin. When her husband restrained her, Þórdís called her witnesses and divorced him. In all the saga literature there are few characters described so completely in so few lines as Þórdís.

Gísli slew Þorgrímr secretly by night (Ch. xvi). His guilt was suspected, but not publicly known. A howe was raised for Þorgrímr beside the lake Seftjörn. Þorgrímr had been a devotee of the god Freyr, and was known as 'Freyr's Priest'. In return, the god loved Þorgrímr so much that he would not allow frost to come between him and Þorgrímr. The howe, in which Þorgrímr lay, remained green and free of frost, though the lake, Seftjörn, and the soil around were frozen hard. As he sat beside the frozen lake, Gísli disclosed his guilt in these cryptic lines (str. 8), which he addressed to his sister, Þórdís:

Teina sék í túni
tál-Gríms vinar fálu,
Gauts þess, er geig of veittak,
Gunnblíks, þáar miklar.

'I see sprouting shoots on Þorgrímr's howe; I see great patches of thawed turf on the tilled field of that warrior whom I struck down.'²

Several critics³ have remarked on the verbal similarity between this strophe and str. 40 of *Guð. II*, which says:

Hugða ek hér í túni	teina fallna,
þá er ek vildak	vaxna láta.... ⁴

¹ My interpretation of the first half of this strophe is very different from those of Finnur Jónsson (*Skjaldeidigting* B, I, 97), and of E. A. Kock (op. cit. § 350) and of other commentators. According to my interpretation there is no kenning in the first half strophe. This might be thought improbable. But it is not unlikely that a poet whose subject was derived from heroic lays might also be influenced by the simpler syntax of those lays.

On the adj. *sveigr* (vacillating, pliable) see Fritzner, *Ordbog*, s.v. *sveigr*, *torsveigr*, *torsveigðr*. Cf. Modern Icelandic *sveigjanlegg*.

² For alternative interpretations of these lines see E. A. Kock, op. cit. § 1075; Finnur Jónsson, *Skjaldeidigting* B, I, 97. The plural form *þáar* is doubtful. Cf. B. M. Ólsen, *Tímarit hins íslenska bókmenntafélags*, 1895, p. 57.

³ E.g. B. M. Ólsen, *Tímarit hins íslenska bókmenntafélags*, Reykjavík, 1895, pp. 57-8; Finnur Jónsson, *Gísla Saga*, 1903, p. 45; Magnus Olsen, *Festskrift til Finnur Jónsson*, Copenhagen, 1928, pp. 6-7.

⁴ Ed. G. Neckel, *Edda*, p. 224.

In this strophe Atli is telling Guðrún about an evil dream, and the young shoots (*teinar*) symbolize his doomed sons.

In 22 of the 36 strophes attributed to him, Gísli describes visions which had appeared to him in dreams. Magnus Olsen¹ has developed the suggestions of earlier scholars that both *Gísli Saga* and the strophes in it have been influenced by heroic legends and lays. He draws especial attention to four of the dream strophes (32-5), in which he again sees the influence of *Guð. II*.

These four strophes of *Gísli Saga* contain four dream pictures, each of which is introduced with the word *hugðak*. The first lines of str. 33 may be cited as an illustration:

Hugðak blóð um báðar,
baug-Hlín, knáar mínar
herðar hvössu sverði
hrænets Regin setja....

'Goddess adorned with rings, I thought that Reginn of the corpse-net (warrior) was smearing blood on both my sturdy shoulders with his sharp sword...'²

In the corresponding passage of *Guð. II* (str. 38-42), four dream pictures are also introduced, each with the word *hugðak*. The contents of the two sets of dreams are also, in some respects, similar. They both forebode death and disaster, symbolized, in each case, by blood and gore.³

The suggestion that some of the strophes of *Gísli Saga* have been directly influenced by heroic legends and lays need not be doubted. Str. 9 shows plainly that its author was well versed in the story of Guðrún. Str. 8 and the dream str. 32-5 suggest that *Guð. II* was one of the lays which influenced the strophes of *Gísli Saga*. Str. 4-5 suggest the influence of *Guð. I* or of a lay of similar taste. It has also been shown that the story of *Gísli Saga* has something in common with heroic legend. M. Olsen suggests that it has been influenced by *Sigurðarkviða en skamma* and perhaps by parts of *Sigrdrífumál*. Even the prose in which *Gísli Saga* is told shows the influence of poetry, most probably that of heroic poetry.

Several scholars have sought to explain how it is that both the strophes and the saga itself have been influenced by heroic legends and lays. The most interesting conclusion is perhaps that of Magnus Olsen.⁴

Olsen suggests that Gísli, to whom the saga attributes the strophes, was himself a student of heroic poetry. He remarks that, according to the saga, Gísli spent his early years in Norway. In Olsen's view, Norway was the home of most of the heroic lays. Gísli must have known these lays intimately, especially *Guð. II*. He must, indeed, have known them so well that they influenced, not only his thoughts, but also his career. Olsen further suggests that, at a much later date, when the prose of the saga was written in Iceland, its author (*forfatteren*) was again influenced by heroic lays. Olsen believes that the author of the prose was influenced by *Sigurðarkviða en skamma* and by parts of *Sigrdrífumál*. Like many other scholars, Olsen assigns these lays to a later date than *Guð. II*.

A similar conclusion is plainly expressed by K. Liestøl. Liestøl writes: 'The heroic poems lived so vividly in the mind of Gísli that he compared his own experiences with occurrences in these poems. And this resemblance must also have

¹ *Gísli saga og helteidigtningen in Festskrift til Finnur Jónsson*, Copenhagen, 1928, pp. 6-14.

See also the same author's paper in *Arkiv för nordisk filologi*, 1930, pp. 150-60.

² For alternative interpretations see Finnur

Jónsson, *Skjaldedigtning* B, I, 103; E. A. Kock, op. cit. § 365.

³ Magnus Olsen, op. cit. pp. 8-9.

⁴ Op. cit. pp. 8-14.

been evident to the sagamen, including the last of them, to whom *Gísli Saga* owes its final and perfect form.¹

This conclusion implies a remarkable coincidence. Early scaldic poets are seldom inspired by the stories and diction of heroic lays. Scaldic and heroic poetry may, as has often been said, be two branches of one tree, but the two branches are generally kept apart. The authors of Family Sagas, writing in the thirteenth century, are comparatively rarely influenced by the substance or style of heroic lays.² The two outstanding exceptions to these general rules are, therefore, said to be the poet Gísli Súrsson, who lived in the tenth century, and the biographer of Gísli, who lived in the thirteenth century.

Magnus Olsen uses his conclusion to establish the daté of *Guðr. II*, which he believes to have influenced the poet Gísli. He maintains that this lay was of Norwegian origin, and that it must have been composed before the middle of the tenth century. For, according to traditional chronology, Gísli was born about 930, and left Norway about 955.

Whenever these lays were composed, it is obvious that they were known in Iceland in the thirteenth century. If it could be proved that they were composed in the tenth century, it would not show when the strophes of *Gísli Saga* were composed, or whether the author of the saga was right in ascribing them to Gísli Súrsson. If, on the other hand, it could be established that lays of this kind were not composed until after the tenth century, it would suggest that the author was historically inaccurate in ascribing the strophes to Gísli Súrsson.

It would be beyond the scope of this paper to discuss the general problems about the dating of the *Edda* lays. It may, nevertheless, be helpful to consider briefly, without reference to *Gísli Saga*, the ages of the two lays of *Guðrún*, which appear to be among those which have influenced the strophes assigned to Gísli. The dates to which scholars assign these lays of *Guðrún* differ by as much as 500 years.

The similarity between the first and second lays of *Guðrún* is so close that one of them must have influenced the other. I shall not attempt to decide which has supplied the motives common to both. G. Neckel³ has suggested that *Guðr. I* has influenced *Guðr. II*, and has adduced several important arguments to support his case. Finnur Jónsson,⁴ on the other hand, supposes that *Guðr. II* is the older of the two. This conclusion is supported by the designation *en forma*, which the Codex Regius applies to *Guðr. II*. Finnur Jónsson believes that *Guðr. II* was composed about 950, and he assigns *Guðr. I* to the latter years of the tenth century.

Finnur Jónsson's conclusions about these lays are in agreement with his general views about the age of the heroic poetry. It would be impossible, in this paper, to discuss the arguments which have led Finnur Jónsson to his conclusions. Nevertheless, the reader does not escape the impression that his methods are somewhat arbitrary. In dealing with this problem, Finnur Jónsson seems reluctant to assign literary monuments, which he so rightly admires, to a date which he considers post-classical.⁵ The artistic value of the lays may not be impaired if they are

¹ *The Origin of the Icelandic Family Sagas*, Oslo, 1930, p. 173.

² The influence of heroic lays may also be seen in *Laxdæla*, though less plainly than in *Gísli Saga*; cf. Einar Ól. Sveinsson, *Laxdæla Saga*, Reykjavík, 1934, pp. xlv ff. See also K. Liestøl, op. cit. pp. 169 ff.; W. P. Ker, *Epic and Romance*, 1922, esp. pp. 209 ff.

³ *Beiträge zur Eddaforschung*, 1908, pp. 295 ff.

⁴ *Den oldnorske og oldislandske Litteraturs Historie*, 2nd ed., I, Copenhagen, 1920, pp. 286 ff., 295 ff.

⁵ General problems relating to the age and home of the *Edda* lays are discussed by Finnur Jónsson, op. cit. I, pp. 37-54, and in many other books and papers by the same author.

found to date from the twelfth or thirteenth instead of from the ninth or tenth century, but their value as monuments of antiquity is certainly reduced.

It was probably considerations of this kind which prompted Finnur Jónsson to write: 'The spirit and culture of the Viking Age (ninth and tenth centuries) come so vividly to light in the heroic poems, that it is hardly conceivable that they were composed much later.'¹ General statements of this kind do not bear scrutiny. It is largely from the heroic lays that we try to form our ideas of the spirit and culture of the Viking Age. Nevertheless, the picture which they give us may well be that of another age, or of a conglomeration of ages. The differences of taste and culture which the heroic lays display are greater than we should expect if they arose merely from individual differences of taste among poets who lived in one period. *Hamðismál* and *Brot* do not read as if they belonged to the same stage of cultural development as the lays of Guðrún or *Sigurðarkviða en skamma*. It is largely on grounds of this kind that some scholars seek to distinguish between older and younger strata among the heroic poems.²

If they are considered from this point of view, such poems as the lays of Guðrún can hardly be assigned to any but the latest period of heroic tradition. Their motives and their 'spirit' are both typical of romantic medieval culture, even though they are cast in a strophic form which dates from the earliest phase of Scandinavian poetry.

Comparatively little is known about the development of heroic poetry among Germanic peoples. It seems, however, that the earliest poets were seldom inspired except by action. They sang of heroic deeds rather than of the motives which prompted them, or of the memories which they left. If this is correct, the oldest, or at any rate the most archaic poems of the Icelandic collection must include *Brot*, parts of *Hamðismál* and parts of the 'Battle of the Goths and the Huns'. In these lays, the psychological interest is little developed. Dialogue is used only to press the action forward, and not to disclose the mind of the speaker. Long speeches and monologue have no place.

As the heroic tradition developed, the interests of those who fostered it changed in Scandinavia, just as they did in Europe. The old stories became so well known, that there was little need for poets to retell them. The new poets were interested, not in what their heroes did, but in why they did it, and in how the heroes suffered after the well-known action had taken place. The author of *Sigurðarkviða en skamma*,³ one of the longest of the heroic lays, shows how little he is interested in the murder of Sigurðr when he dismisses it with the words:

Stóð til hjarta hjórr Sigurði. (Str. 21.)

This poet did not stint his words when he described the moral conflict in Brynhildr's mind before Sigurðr's murder and Guðrún's sorrow after it.

In the two lays of Guðrún the interest in psychology is developed as highly as it is in *Sigurðarkviða en skamma*. The authors of these lays pay little heed to action. Sentiment is their sole concern.

In *Guðr.* 1 the heroine is depicted sitting beside the dead body of her husband. The love-motive, in which the older poets had little interest, is here the central

¹ *Bókmentasaga íslendinga*, Copenhagen, 1904-5, p. 66.

² On these questions see especially A. Heusler, *Die Lieder der Lücke im Codex Regius in Festschrift für H. Paul*, Strassburg, 1902; G. Neckel,

op. cit.; H. Schneider, *Germanische Heldensage*, 1, Berlin, 1928, especially pp. 134-57. A number of the statements made below are derived from these works.

³ Ed. G. Neckel, *Edda*, pp. 202-13.

theme. The intensity of the love of Guðrún and Sigurðr is described in these words, which Gullrond addresses to Guðrún:

Ykkar vissa ek	ástir mestar
manna allra	fyr mold ofan.
Unðir þú hvárki	úti né inni,
systir mín,	nema hjá Sigurði. (Str. 17.)

Earlier tradition knew nothing of this passionate love of hero and heroine.

The situation described in *Guðr. I* is similar to that described in *Âventiure XVII* of the *Nibelungenlied*. We read in this *Âventiure* how Kriemhilt (Guðrún) stood beside the murdered body of Sigfrid outside her door.

In *Guðr. I* the poet describes how Gullrond uncovered the body of Sigurðr, so that Guðrún might gaze upon it:

Svipti hon blæju	af Sigurði
ok vatt vengi	fyr vífs knéum:
'littu á ljúfan,	leggðu munn við grön,
sem þú hálsaðir	heilan stilli'. (Str. 13.)

Similarly, it is related in *Âventiure XVII* (1068-9)¹ how the hero's coffin was uncovered, so that Kriemhilt might gaze for the last time on Sigfrid:

Dô bat si's alsô lange	mit jâmers sinnen stare,
daz man zebrechen muose	den vil hêrlîchen sarc.
Dô brâhte man die vrouwen	dâ si in ligen vant.
Si huop sîn schœne houbet	mit ir vil wîzen hant;
dô kuste s'alsô tôten	den edelen ritter guot.
Ir vil liechten ougen	vor leide wéinêten bluot.

It is described in str. 16 of *Guðr. I* how Guðrún wept so loud that the geese in the courtyard shrieked in terror (cf. p. 378 above). This scene is described even more extravagantly in *Sigurðarkviða en skamma* (str. 29), which says:

svá sló hon sváran	sínar hendr,
at kváðu við	kálkar í vá,
ok gullu við	gæss í túni.

Whether the version of this strophe preserved in *Guðr. I* or that in *Sigurðarkviða en skamma* is the earlier, its source cannot have been far removed from that of the *Nibelungenlied* (XVII, 1025), which describes how Sigfrid's friends and kinsmen weep for him:

Sigemunt der herre	den fürsten umbeslôz.
dô wart von sînen vriunden	der jâmer alsô grôz,
daz von dem starken wuofe	palas unde sal
and ouch diu stat ze Wormez	von ir wéinén erschal.

Guðr. II is a strange poem. Nothing happens before our eyes. Guðrún merely tells her audience about the sufferings of her past life. It is a kind of elegy, a tragic and pathetic poem. It is introspective, and leaves the impression that the heroine is sorry, not so much for her dead husband as for herself. The following lines will serve as an example:

Nótt þótti mér	niðmyrkr vera,
er ek sárla satk	yfir Sigurði,
úlfar þóttumk	öllu betri,
ef þeir léti mik	lífi týna
eða brendi mik,	sem birkinn við. (Str. 12.)

The figure of Grímhildr, mother of the Gjúkungar, plays a notable part in *Guðr. II*. This woman appears only in sources which we have reason to assign to a late date,

¹ *Das Nibelungenlied*, ed. K. Bartsch, Leipzig, 1931.

and we may suppose that she did not exist in the earliest Scandinavian traditions. She was probably introduced, in the first place, as a witch to mix the magic potion, so that Sigurðr might forget his betrothal to Brynhildr without staining his spotless honour. The author of *Guðr. II* has moved a step further and, in his hands, Grímhildr has come to life. Now she mixes a second magic potion, this time so that Guðrún might forget her love for Sigurðr and her hatred of her brothers. The author has borrowed the character of Grímhildr from Norse lays which themselves belong to the later, Christian period. The hatred which Guðrún shows of her brothers in the early part of *Guðr. II* (e.g. in str. 9) contrasts with her traditional loyalty to them, such as she shows in *Atlakviða*. But this preference of husband for brothers finds its parallel in the *Nibelungenlied*. It is characteristic of medieval morality, rather than of the heroic age.

B. Sijmons¹ did not believe that the greater part of *Guðr. II* (str. 1-36) was composed so early that it could have influenced the historical Gísli, who lived from about 930-78. He remarked, however, that the passages of *Guðr. II* which appear to have influenced Gísli's poems were all to be found at the end of the lay, between str. 37 and 44. He suggested that str. 37-44 had been wrongly attached to *Guðr. II*, and that they were originally part of some other lay, which might have been older. He inferred that the supposed older lay might even have been composed before 950, though he admitted that its extant strophes (str. 37-44 of *Guðr. II*) did not give the impression of great antiquity.

It must be conceded that the two sections of *Guðr. II* hang badly together. In the first section modern taste and motives predominate, and Guðrún's love for Sigurðr is emphasized. In the second, the older tradition, Guðrún's loyalty to her brothers, is brought out. But the means whereby the poet combined the conflicting traditions are evident, the more so because of his unskilful hand. It was largely to combine the version of the story which he had learnt from modern sources with that which he knew from the older sources that the poet introduced the witch Grímhildr with her magic potion.

Both these lays of Guðrún show how Scandinavian poets were influenced by changes of taste in medieval Europe, and how they combined the traditions of Christian Germany with the legends which had reached them, as pagans, several centuries earlier.

Gísli Saga and Gísli's poems also show the influence both of older and of younger traditions. Gísli remembers the older Guðrún when, in str. 9, he says that his sister has not so steadfast a heart as she. He is inspired by younger traditions when he describes the weeping Auðr (str. 4-5), and when he discourses on the virtues of helping the blind, the lame and the armless. He is a product of medieval culture when he plaintively rebukes his sister and brother for their failing loyalty towards him, and when he suffers for many years as a martyred outlaw.

Several scholars have doubted whether all the strophes which the saga assigns to Gísli were really composed by him. Guðbrandr Vigfússon held somewhat different views about these poems at different periods of his life. In his *Tímatál*² Vigfússon said that Gísli was one of the grandest poets of the old tradition. His dream strophes were among the finest monuments of Old Norse poetry. When he wrote his *Prolegomena to Sturlunga*,³ Vigfússon still admired the strophes of *Gísli Saga*, but he then believed that they were the work of a poet who lived, not in the

¹ B. Sijmons and H. Gering, *Kommentar zu den Liedern der Edda*, II, Halle, 1931, pp. 290-1.

² *Um tímatál í íslendinga sögum*, Copenhagen, 1855, p. 362.

³ *Sturlunga Saga*, I, Oxford, 1878, p. lii.

tenth, but in the thirteenth century. In the *Corpus Poeticum Boreale*¹ he writes of the author of these strophes as a 'versifier', who had taken genuine old verses and worked them up into bastard *dróttkvætt*. Vigfússon now detected the influence of the heroic lays on the strophes of *Gísla Saga*. He suspected that the 'versifier' had had access to the so-called *Kárukjóð* (i.e. *Helgakviða Hundingsbana*, II, 1-13). But he thought this versifier was poorly acquainted with ancient poetry, and consequently his whole work was 'clumsy and botched'. In *Origines Islandicae*² Vigfússon maintained that the strophes were composed after the saga itself. He distinguished two types of poetry in *Gísla Saga*. The author of the first type, which included some of the dream strophes, was in touch with heroic tradition, and had probably read a few lines of an Eddic lay. The other strophes were mere verbiage of the thirteenth century, added by an editor to ornament the saga. It seems that Vigfússon's taste was now dictated by his keen historical sense and his love of antiquity.

Other scholars have also doubted whether Gísli really composed all the strophes which the saga assigns to him. Guðmundr Þorláksson,³ who questioned Gísli's authorship, was satisfied that they must be much older than the saga, and this view has been widely held. B. M. Ólsen⁴ said that the dream strophes were probably not Gísli's work, but he did not discuss their authorship in detail. He suspected that the complicated psychology, the dual personality which the rival dream women symbolized, could hardly have been appreciated by an outlaw in pagan Iceland. Ólsen suggested that some of these dream strophes were so deeply Christian in outlook that they must be the work of a cleric. If this were so, Ólsen thought it likely that some of the other strophes were also composed by a poet who lived later than Gísli. He once suggested that this poet might perhaps also have been the author of the saga.

Finnur Jónsson⁵ spoke more emphatically than his predecessors. For a time he nearly dispelled the suspicion that the saga was historically inaccurate in ascribing its strophes to Gísli. He said that there was not the slightest reason to doubt the saga's statement. Form, content and language all showed that the strophes were Gísli's work. A later author could not have imagined the trials of the outlawed man so vividly that he could depict them in strophes like these. Many scholars have accepted this view. It may, however, be helpful to re-examine the question.

No one can read these strophes without being struck, as B. M. Ólsen was struck, by the Christian piety which colours them. According to the saga (Ch. VIII and X), Gísli had met Christian men when he visited Denmark. He was influenced by Christian teaching and, when he returned to Iceland, he abandoned some, though not all, of the conventional pagan ritual. According to the Longer version, Gísli was marked with the Cross in Denmark.⁶ But both Norway, where Gísli was brought up, and Iceland, where he spent most of his adult years, were pagan lands. It is hard to believe that, after such casual contact with Christianity, Gísli had all the appreciation of Christian thought, and had such deep experience of Christian mysticism, as the saga implies that he had.

In Ch. XXII the good dream woman appears to Gísli. She tells him to abandon

¹ Vol. II, 1883, p. 331.

² Vol. II, 1905, p. 190.

³ *Udsigt over de norsk-islandske Skjalde*, Copenhagen, 1882, pp. 46-7.

⁴ *Um íslendinga sögur*, published posthumously, Reykjavík, 1937-9, pp. 118 ff.

⁵ *Gísla Saga*, 1903, pp. xxi ff., cf. *Den oldnorske og oldislandske Litteraturs Historie*, I, pp. 507 ff.

⁶ *Í þenna tíma var kristni komin í Danmörk, ok létu þeir Gíslí félagar þrimsnask* (Ch. XIII).

pagan beliefs and practices: 'at láta leiðask enn forna sið ok nema enga galdra né forneskju....' The words of this guardian spirit are preserved in str. 16, which the hero addresses to his wife, Auðr:

Blakkskyndir hjalp blindum,
Baldr hygg at því skjaldar,
illt kveða háð at hqltum,
handlausum Tý granda.

This strophe offers many textual difficulties, and admits of various readings and interpretations, though its general meaning is not obscure. It might be rendered: 'Sea-farer, help the blind, think of that, warrior. It is wicked to mock the lame, and to injure the armless man.'¹

These sentiments are exclusively Christian. F. Paasche² sees in this strophe the direct influence of the *Ezra Apocalypse*, which says: 'Laugh not a lame man to scorn, defend the maimed, and let the blind man come unto the sight of my glory.'³

Str. 16 is the last of a group of four strophes, which the poet addresses to his wife on one occasion. These four strophes have much in common, and must be regarded as a single poem or *flokkr*. In str. 15 the poet describes how his guardian spirit had warned him to pay no heed to the magic charms and pagan thoughts of evil poets (*Gerskat næmr galdrs*).⁴ He must learn nothing of poetry but that which is fine and ennobling.

In str. 13-14 the poet tells how his dream guardian leads him into a hall where he meets his friends and relatives. She shows him seven fires, which signify the number of years he has yet to live. The hall in which Gísli is united with his dead friends and relatives is reminiscent of the story of Þorsteinn Þorskátr.⁵ When Þorsteinn died, the hill, Helgafell, opened to receive him, and there he joined his dead kinsmen. There are many similar tales, both in old and later Icelandic. The flickering flames, some of which have nearly burnt out, are reminiscent of the story of the lamp of life, as told in *Norna-Gests þátr*.⁶ Norna-Gestr does not die until the candle which he carries is burnt out. This motive is unquestionably of foreign origin. The number seven also suggests the use of standard European motives.⁷

Since str. 13-14 are prophetic, they lead to the suspicion that Gísli did not compose them himself. It is more likely that they are the work of a later poet, who knew the course of Gísli's life. If these strophes are composed by Gísli, we must conclude, not only that Gísli was fully Christianized, but also that he was a prophet. Even this conclusion would be preferable to that of Finnur Jónsson.⁸ Finnur Jónsson supposes that Gísli dreamed the dreams and composed the strophes, but that he did not die precisely seven years later. It was merely tradition which had made Gísli's life conform with his own prophecy.

¹ On this strophe see also Jón Helgason, *Acta Philologica Scandinavica*, vi, 1931, pp. 55-62; Finnur Jónsson, *Skjaldedigtning*, B, i, 99.

² *Festskrift til Finnur Jónsson*, pp. 200-2.

³ *II Eedras*, ed. W. Oesterley, London, 1933, p. 11.

⁴ The general sense of str. 15 is plain. Several critics object to the construction *gerskat næmr galdrs* because it implies a strained word-order. The construction is, however, supported by the prose of Ch. xxii. The poet is warned: *at nema enga galdra né forneskju*. For other interpreta-

tions see E. A. Kock, op. cit. § 354; K. Reichardt, op. cit. pp. 86-7.

⁵ *Eyrbyggja Saga*, ed. Einar Ól. Sveinsson, Reykjavík, 1935, Ch. xi.

⁶ Ed. E. Wilken in *Die prosaische Edda*, 1912, pp. 235-61.

⁷ Cf. Finnur Jónsson, *Den oldnorske og oldislandske Litt. Hist.*, II, pp. 839-40; N. Kershaw, *Stories and Ballads*, Cambridge, 1921, p. 13; H. Dehmer, *Primitives Erzählungsgut in den Islendinga Sögur*, Leipzig, 1927, pp. 108-9.

⁸ Edition of *Gísli Saga*, 1903, p. xxii.

If the dream strophes of Ch. xxii were composed by a poet who lived later than Gísli, it is unlikely that those preserved in the other chapters are Gísli's work. Most of them are prophetic, even though their prophecies are not all so precise as those in Ch. xxii. In several of the dream strophes the poet describes visions of the future life. He relates how the good spirit promises him relief from his sufferings, and shows him a bed, upon which he will rest on soft cushions (str. 23). In str. 26 it is told how the Lord of Men (*Alvaldr alda*) has driven Gísli alone from his house, in order that he may learn to know 'another world' (*annan heim*). This last allusion is somewhat obscure. The 'other world' probably has some relation to the Christian heaven, and perhaps to Christian faith, which the poet will learn to value in his solitary life.

In all the dream strophes the dominant theme is the conflict between good and evil. Thus the good spirit represents Christian teaching, while the evil one, her hands besmirched with blood, symbolizes the old religion. The one gives the poet good advice, while the other tells him wicked things, and offers him only evil prospects (Ch. xxii).

The conduct of these two spirits is less like that of traditional *fylgjur* than of the good and evil guardian angels, who played so great a part in medieval Christianity. These divine and Satanic guardians were well-known to the early theologians of Norway and Iceland.¹ But it is unlikely that a man like the historical Gísli, who had spent nearly all his life among pagans, would have understood these symbols of the abstract qualities of good and bad. For it is doubtful whether Scandinavian pagans recognized any sharp distinction between good and evil. The poets of the *Hávamál* knew of no such sharp distinction.

No less than 22 of the 36 strophes assigned to Gísli are concerned with dreams. S. A. Krijn,² in a very useful paper, attempted to divide these dream strophes into three groups, in which she saw three distinct poems. Str. 13-16, 22-24 and 32-35 hang closely together, and may be said to form distinct groups. But the thoughts expressed, and the symbols used in these dream strophes are so uniform, and so distinct from other scaldic poetry, that they can hardly be the work of more than one poet.

The dream strophes are the result of Christian experiences such as an Icelandic Gísli's age could not have known. But this does not show at what date they were composed. They might be assigned to a poet who lived at any time between the Conversion (A.D. 1000) and the time when the saga was written in its present form.

Several scholars have maintained that, even though Gísli was not their author, the dream strophes must be much older than the saga. It is said that their style and language both lead to this conclusion. Hence, some scholars conclude, the strophes were composed, not by Gísli, but by a Christian poet who lived soon after Gísli's death.

It is hard to decide the age of these strophes from their style or technique. The metrical form used in most of them is an ancient one, but this does not show that they are old. The same metre was still used by Icelandic poets of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

It may be helpful in determining the date of the dream strophes to consider their 'spirit', their thoughts and the symbols in which they are expressed. If they are

¹ See, e.g., *Michaels Saga in Heilagra manna sögur*, I (ed. C. R. Unger, 1877), p. 683; *Gammel norsk Homliebog* (ed. C. R. Unger, 1864), p. 183.

² *Arkiv för nord. fil.* LI, 1935, pp. 69 ff.

considered from this point of view, these strophes appear to have something in common with the mystical poetry of the late twelfth century. They seem sometimes to be influenced by the kind of symbolism which is used at its best in such poems as *Harmsól* and *Sólarljóð*. Both of these poems describe visions of Heaven and Hell. The place where Gísli is to rest on a bed of soft cushions (str. 23) is not altogether unlike the scene of heavenly repose described in *Sólarljóð* (str. 72):¹

Hvílur þeirra
váru á himingeislum
hafðar hagliga.

Like the dream strophes of *Gísla Saga*, *Sólarljóð* is a Christian poem which uses a pre-Christian technique. It is also influenced, though superficially, by the sentiments of *Hávamál* and of other pagan poetry. It could not be suggested that the dream strophes have been influenced directly by *Sólarljóð* or *Harmsól*. But it is not extravagant to suppose that the author of the dream strophes had read the great Christian poems of the twelfth century, as well as the older and younger lays of the heroic tradition.²

The saga attributes 14 strophes other than the dream strophes to its hero. The most striking of all these is str. 9, which was mentioned above (p. 379). In this strophe the poet alludes in plain words to the tragedy of Guðrún Gjúkadóttir. He is citing heroic legend, though it cannot be clearly decided which heroic lay has inspired him. The story of Guðrún's fraternal loyalty is told in *Atlakviða* and several other sources. It was evidently part of the oldest, as well as of the latest Scandinavian tradition about Guðrún. On such evidence, str. 9 might be assigned to any period between 850 and 1300. But since it is preserved in the same saga, str. 9 should probably be ascribed to the same poet as the other strophes which bear the unusual marks of heroic tradition. I have suggested that the emotional romanticism, which is inherent in some of the strophes of *Gísla Saga*, as in some of the Eddic lays, belongs to Christian Iceland rather than to pagan Norway.

It has been argued that some of the strophes of *Gísla Saga* contain ancient linguistic forms which prove that they were composed at an early date.³ The metre sometimes demands forms with uncontracted vowels, such as *áar*, *gráum*, *féi*, instead of the contracted forms *ár*, *grám*, *fé*. The vowels in such forms as these were generally contracted towards the end of the twelfth century. It was not, however, long before the uncontracted forms began to reappear, because of analogy. It is doubtful whether the contraction was ever completed. As has already been observed, Icelandic poets did not conform with this phonological law.⁴ They often used uncontracted forms after the contracted ones had become common in prose, and continued to use contracted ones after the uncontracted forms had been restored. This argument cannot, therefore, be used to show when the strophes were composed. It has also been suggested that the use of the archaic form *Þorketill*

¹ *Sólarljóð*, ed. Björn M. Ólsen, Reykjavík, 1915, p. 21.

² F. Seewald (*Die Gísla Saga*, Göttingen, 1934, p. 118) suggested that the diction of str. 5 had been influenced by the fragment *Máriuflakkr* (*Skjaldedigtning*, B, I, 634), which describes Mary weeping at the Cross. The evidence for direct influence of the *Máriuflakkr* on str. 5 is not strong, though it is possible that the figure of the weeping Auðr was partly coloured by traditions about the weeping Mary. There must have been many poems and legends on this

subject. The fourteenth-century *Márugrátr* (esp. the diction of str. 49, *Skjaldedigtning*, B, II, 519) might also be compared with Gísli's str. 4-5. The influence of the weeping Mary would not, of course, preclude the influence of the weeping Guðrún. See p. 378 above.

³ See Finnur Jónsson, *Gísla Saga*, 1903, p. xxi; *Den oldnorske og oldislandske Litt. Hist.* I, pp. 508 ff.

⁴ Cf. Björn K. Þórólfsson, *Um íslenskar orðmyndir*, Reykjavík, 1925, pp. xxi f.; A. Noreen, *Altisländische Grammatik*, 4th ed., Halle, 1923, § 130.

(for *Porkell*), in str. 21, is indicative of an early date. But *Porketill* continued to be recognized by scribes as a poetic form of the name long after *Porkell* had become common in prose.¹

The diction of the strophes of *Gísla Saga* does not give any clear indication of their age. The apparent use of the word *sál* (soul, spirit) in str. 9 suggests a late date of composition. This word is generally regarded as a loan from English. It is rarely found except in specifically Christian texts, where it generally has the meaning 'immortal soul'. Its presence in str. 9 is demanded by Finnur Jónsson's interpretation, and by most others, no less than by mine, but undue weight should not be attached to this argument, for these interpretations may be at fault.²

It has been shown that influences which appear to belong to the medieval period are to be found both in the dream strophes and in others which the saga preserves. Since these influences are distinctive, and are not often found in scaldic strophes of family sagas, it seems probable that they should be traced to one, and not to several poets. There remain a number of strophes which have not been mentioned in this paper. Most of these bear a certain resemblance to the dream strophes. Two of them (10 and 11) are composed in *kviðuháttir*. This is the metre of *Ynglingatal*, of *Háleyggjatal* and of Egill's *Arinbjarnarkviða* and *Sonatorrek*. It is certainly one of the most ancient metres, but it is scarcely ever used for detached scaldic strophes (*lausavísur*). Its use in *Gísla Saga* suggests the hand of a late poet with antiquarian tastes, rather than that of an ancient poet.³

Str. 2 is somewhat exceptional. It describes the burning of Gísli's home in Norway. Unlike most of the strophes in this saga, it is objective and picturesque. It has characteristics of the older period of Scaldic verse, and is perhaps an ancient strophe. But this does not show that str. 2 is Gísli's work. It is preserved only in the Longer text of the saga, and in a passage which most critics believe to be an interpolation. It seems probable, therefore, that this is an ancient strophe which has been assigned wrongly to Gísli.

It has already been shown that the plot and the prose of *Gísla Saga* bear some of the same distinctive marks as the strophes. The saga itself is sentimental and romantic, and appears to be influenced by poetic diction and thought. It may, therefore, be suggested that the prose and the verse are both the work of the same author. This seems more probable than Liestøl's suggestion which would imply that the author of the strophes and a series of successive 'Sagamen' were all subjected to the same exceptional influences.

It has been argued that statements made in the prose do not always agree precisely with those made in the strophes. On these grounds it has been concluded that the prose and the verse cannot be by the same author. In fact, the differences are very slight, and might easily have arisen during scribal transmission.⁴ The textual histories of many sagas show how great were the alterations made by scribes in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.⁵ The similarity between the prose and the verse of *Gísla Saga* is much more striking than the differences.

There are reasons to doubt that the historical Gísli was a poet. Snorri and the other critical writers of the thirteenth century say nothing of him. Probably these

¹ E. H. Lind, *Norsk-isländska dopnamn*, Uppsala, 1905-15, s.v. *Porkell*.

² On *sál* see H. Falk and A. Torp, *Etymologisk Ordbog*, Oslo, 1903, s.v. *sjæl*. For another view see Seewald, op. cit. p. 122.

³ Str. 18 is in rhyming couplets (*hin minnsta rúnhenda*), which suggests a late date of com-

position (cf. A. Heusler, *Deutsche Versgeschichte*, I, Berlin, 1925, pp. 289 ff.).

⁴ The more important of these inconsistencies are pointed out in Benedikt Sveinsson's edition, pp. 197-217.

⁵ Cf. *Víga-Glúms Saga*, ed. G. Turville-Petre, Oxford, 1940, pp. xxii ff.

early critics would have mentioned him if he had really been so great a poet as the author of the strophes attributed to him certainly was. But there is no positive reason to doubt that Gísli lived. The outline of his life, as it is told in the saga, may perhaps be true. *Landnámabók* gives evidence that Gísli lived,¹ even though the genealogies drawn in *Landnámabók* do not agree precisely with those of *Gísli Saga*. Gísli is rarely mentioned in other sources,² and it is doubtful whether he was a famous man until the saga was written. It is unlikely that the character of the historical outlaw bore a close resemblance to the artistic description of the thirteenth century. The author probably used traditional tales about Gísli, but there is little reason to believe that these were very many or very full. The author drew freely on standard motives, such as were applied to many heroes in his day.³ He treated his subject according to the taste of a medieval and Christian culture. He was influenced, strongly though probably indirectly, by the changing artistic fashions of Europe. Consequently his work lacks the austerity which characterises many of the best Icelandic sagas. It is for this reason that *Gísli Saga* appeals especially to those trained to appreciate the romantic literatures of medieval and post-medieval Europe.

I shall not attempt to decide who was the author of *Gísli Saga*, nor precisely when he lived. Some idea of the age of *Gísli Saga* may perhaps be obtained by comparing it with other sagas. The slaughter of Þorgrímr by Gísli, as told in Ch. xvi, closely resembles the story of the slaughter of Helgi Ásbjarnarson, which is related in *Droplaugarsona Saga* (Ch. xiii). The similarity of the phrases and motives used in these two sagas is so close, that one of them must have copied directly from the other. Björn K. Þórólfsson⁴ and A. Heusler⁵ both concluded that *Gísli Saga* had influenced *Droplaugarsona Saga*. Heusler believed that this influence was exercised mainly through an oral medium, and that it took place before either saga was written. His conclusion was based on a forced and unnecessarily complicated hypothesis. In reality the verbal similarity between the two passages is so close that it can only be concluded that the author of one copied from a written version of the other.

I. Gordon⁶ studied the relationship between *Gísli Saga* and *Droplaugarsona Saga* in considerable detail. Her conclusion was the opposite to that of Björn Þórólfsson and Heusler. She showed that, as told in *Droplaugarsona Saga*, the story is, in many ways, more logical and better placed than it is in *Gísli Saga*. She concluded that the author of *Gísli Saga* had borrowed the story from *Droplaugarsona Saga*. In this case, *Gísli Saga* must be a younger work than *Droplaugarsona Saga*.

Einar Ól. Sveinsson⁷ compared *Gísli Saga* with *Eyrbyggja Saga*. He suggested that *Eyrbyggja* had borrowed the story of Gísli's death and a few other incidents

¹ *Landnámabók*, ed. Finnur Jónsson, Copenhagen, 1900, *Hauksbók*, pp. 39, 46, *Sturlubók*, pp. 162, 169. Gísli's relationship with Snorri goði is mentioned in *Njáls Saga*, cxiv.

² *Íslendinga Saga* (*Sturlunga Saga*, ed. G. Vigfússon, I, 247), in a story relating to the year 1221, mentions a spear called 'Grásiða', which people said had once belonged to Gísli Súrsson (cf. Björn M. Ólsen), *Um íslendinga sögur*, pp. 128-9. It is not possible to decide from this passage whether Sturla knew *Gísli Saga* when he wrote the *Íslendinga Saga*.

³ A number of these are cited by H. Dehmer, op. cit., esp. pp. 46, 88, 93, 101. The story of the vengeance taken by the youthful sons of

Vésteinn for their father (*Gísli Saga*, Ch. xxviii-xxix) seems also to contain standard motives. It has something in common with the story of Gestr Þorhallsson and Víga-Stýrr (*Heiðarvíga Saga*, Ch. viii-ix). Ultimately such stories may be related with legends like that of Váli who avenged his brother Baldr when one night old (*Völuspá*, ed. Neckel, str. 31 f.).

⁴ *Droplaugarsona Saga* in *Festschrift til Finnur Jónsson*, pp. 45-66.

⁵ *Berührungen zwischen den Isländergeschichten in Deutsche Islandforschung*, 1930, pp. 220-31.

⁶ *Medium Ævum*, III, 1934, pp. 79-94.

⁷ *Eyrbyggja Saga*, 1935, pp. xxi-xxii.

from *Gísla Saga*, for the relevant passages of *Eyrbyggja* appear to be summarized from *Gísla Saga*. If this is so, *Gísla Saga* must be older than *Eyrbyggja Saga*.

Droplaugarsona Saga is probably among the oldest family sagas, even though it can hardly be as old as 1180, as Björn Þórólfsson supposed.¹ *Eyrbyggja Saga* was assigned by its latest editor to about the year 1220, though there are reasons to believe it is somewhat younger than that. Earlier scholars have suggested that it was written 1240-50.

There are indications that Styrmir fróði (died 1245) did not know *Gísla Saga*, or, at any rate, that he did not use it when he made his version of *Landnámabók*. Styrmir probably worked in the third decade of the thirteenth century. There are similar indications that Sturla Þórðarson (died 1284) used *Gísla Saga* when he compiled his version of *Landnámabók*.² Sturla probably worked after 1260, perhaps even after 1270. It may be suggested that *Gísla Saga* is younger than *Styrmisbók* but older than *Sturlubók*.

Gísla Saga cannot be among the oldest family sagas. Its author shows a studied artistry, which is typical of the later rather than of the older period. His taste is romantic and even sentimental. His work shows influences which the authors of the oldest family sagas avoided. But he lived at a time when the scholarly interest in heroic lays and scaldic poetry was still at its height. It might be suggested that he belonged to the generation of Ólafr hvítaskáld (born 1210) rather than to that of Snorri Sturluson (born 1178).

G. TURVILLE-PETRE

OXFORD

¹ Op. cit. p. 64.

² Cf. Jón Jóhannesson, *Gerðir Landnámabókar*, Reykjavík, 1941, pp. 105 ff.

LINGUISTICS IN SOVIET TURKMENIA

Before the October Revolution the Turkmenian language was almost unknown to science. Papers which appeared on rare occasions dealt mainly with belles-lettres and folklore, but rarely with the language as such. Apart from the brief notes, mainly on the written language, which we find in the works of I. N. Berezin G. Vamberi, N. Ilminsky, A. Volodin, A. N. Samoilovich, F. E. Korsh, and a few other research workers, no single work published before the revolution was devoted specially to the study of the Turkmenian language.

The scientific value of the few text-books of Turkmenian for Russians published before the revolution was not very great.

The October Soviet Revolution resulted in a tremendous economic and cultural progress among the people of Turkmenia. The cultural progress made great demands of the national literary language, which had to convey new, modern ideas. One of the great benefits brought to Turkmenia by Soviet power, therefore, was the rationalization of the art of writing, the development of the literary language and the enrichment of its vocabulary.

The first steps in the linguistic field were of an extremely difficult nature, not only because the old Turkmenian language did not answer present-day requirements but also because only a very small minority of the population of Turkmenia had mastered even the barest elements of reading and writing.

The absence of qualified workers in the field of Turkmenian philology meant that the early work (up to 1926) was of a crude empirical nature and was of an entirely utilitarian character.

Planned research work on the Turkmenian language began after the peoples of Central Asia formed their Soviet republics. The guiding philological body in the Turkmenian Soviet Socialist Republic was the Senate of the People's Commissariat of Education, which in 1926 worked out the fundamental principles for writing Turkmenian with a Latinized alphabet, and in 1927 field work began in the study of Turkmenian dialects. In 1928 the Senate and the Turkmenian Research Institute were reformed as the Institute of Turkmenian Culture, whose Language Sector directed all the research work on the Turkmenian language. In 1932 the Sector of Humanities of the Institute was reorganized as the Turkmenian State Institute of History, Language and Literature, which divided into two independent institutes in 1936—the Institute of Language and Literature and the Institute of History. In 1940 these two institutes were again merged and in 1941 became part of the newly organized Turkmenian Branch of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., again taking the name of the Institute of History, Language and Literature. In addition to the studies carried on in the above institutes, the Department of the Turkmenian Language and General Linguistics of the Ashkhabad State Pedagogical Institute has done considerable research in the sphere of Turkmenian philology since 1931.

In the earlier period, prior to 1935–6, research work was naturally confined to the collection and analysis of the necessary linguistic material without any general conclusions or summaries being made. At the Language Conference held in 1930, which had as its object the regulation of the orthography and terminology of the Turkmenian language, the influence of the new linguistic research centre was

scarcely felt, although by 1934 the reform of the Turkmenian alphabet which led to the suppression of several superfluous letters (such as the retracted variants of the velars 'g' and 'k') was successful only on account of the careful theoretical preparation which had been made.

Linguistic expeditions to almost all districts of Turkmenia, carried out between 1927 and 1935, obtained extensive material in phonetic transcription on the main Turkmenian dialects (Yomud, Tekin, Hoklen, Ersarin, Sadyr and Saryk) as well as of a number of minor dialects. At the same time the phonetics laboratory of the Institute of Turkmenian Culture laid the foundation of the experimental study of Turkmenian philology; amongst the more important work done was the making of 180 phonological recordings and an analysis of the articulation of separate sounds in the Turkmenian language by means of palatograms. In addition to the work done by the local scientific bodies the Academy of Sciences sent an expedition to Merv in 1930 (Professor N. K. Dmitriev and his colleagues).

The success achieved in the scientific study of the language and its dialects made it possible to raise the question of a radical re-examination of the Turkmenian literary language in order to provide it with a firm basis in accordance with the concepts of the New Linguistics. The First Turkmenian Linguistic Congress, held in Ashkhabad in 1936, was called for this purpose and was attended by a number of leading linguists from Leningrad, Moscow and from republics of the Soviet Union in addition to our local specialists.

Lengthy and comprehensive preparations were made for the congress. Amongst the field work undertaken was a series of expeditions directed by Professor S. E. Malov, Corresponding Member of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., to study the general tendencies of speech development of the Ashkhabad industrial workers and the most advanced collective farm peasantry of all parts of the Republic. The language of the press was discussed, the results of the former linguistic expeditions were summarized, etc. The Congress laid down the main principles for the further development of the Turkmenian literary language, to ensure, on the one hand, the all-round employment of the potentialities inherent in the language itself and, on the other hand, the possibility of enriching the vocabulary of the language by the introduction of international scientific and technical terminology; new, detailed rules of orthography and rules for the adaptation of new loan words were adopted.

The decision taken by the Congress to bring the Turkmenian literary language closer to the languages of the sister republics of the Soviet Union, particularly as regards the Russian language, found expression several years later in the adoption of a Russianized alphabet in place of the former Latinized alphabet, a measure that was carried out on the initiative of public bodies in Turkmenistan.

The years that followed the Congress saw a rapid development of research work in the sphere of Turkmenian philology. One of the factors which played an important part in this work was the appearance in the field of a number of young Turkmenian philologists who had received post-graduate training in the Department of the Turkmenian Language and General Linguistics of the Ashkhabad Pedagogical Institute under the direction of the present writer. Amongst these young scientific workers were F. Azimov, B. M. Karryev, H. M. Bailiev, M. N. Hydyrov, M. Kosayev and A. Kekilov. Another five young post-graduate students of philology are at present working on their final theses. Specialists in the Turkmenian language also received training under Professor N. K. Dmitriev at the Institute of Language and Writing in Moscow and under Professor E. E. Bartels,

Corresponding Member of the Academy of Sciences in the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. in Leningrad.

The organization of the Turkmenian Branch of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. in 1941 and the great help given to Turkmenian scientists by the specialists of the Academy had a great effect on the development of Turkmenian science in general and of philology in particular.

Despite the comparatively short time that has elapsed since the scientific study of the Turkmenian language began, the Turkmenian philological school has succeeded in obtaining important results in many spheres of linguistics. The following is a short summary of the work that has been done.

In phonology and phonetics: analysis by means of palatograms of the articulation of the sounds of the Turkmenian language; the phonological recording of specimens of pronunciation of a number of Turkmenian dialects; the determination of the phonetic system of the Turkmenian language; the study of combinatory sound changes and their role in the process of development of the language.

In morphology: the study of affixation as the main feature in word-building and word change in Turkmenian; the study of vestiges of incorporation; the determination of the presence in Turkmenian of multi-functional flectional affixes and the investigation of their origin; the explanation on the basis of Turkmenian of the origin of internal inflexions; study of the main tendencies of the development of the forms of words in Turkmenian; the establishment of the presence in Turkmenian of morphemes having emotional-expressive functions; the laying of the foundations of the study of grammatical categories in Turkmenian; a number of grammatical categories have been established in Turkmenian whose existence was formerly either unknown or little known; a more accurate study has been made of form words in Turkic languages and the specific features of certain types of form words established; the genesis of the past perfect tense of the verb has been explained; the study of the origin of the present tense has been made in detail; the genesis of the verbal personal endings has been explained.

In the field of syntax: the foundations of the scientific study of Turkmenian syntax have been laid; a deep study has been made of the syntactical role of participial, adverbial-participial and verbal noun forms; a theory has been established concerning the main types of complex subordinate sentences in the Turkic languages (analytical, synthetic and analytico-synthetic); the peculiar nature of the formal connexion between main and dependent clauses in the Turkmenian sentence has been dealt with; the problem of the genesis of complex subordinate sentences in the languages of the Turkic system is now being studied; work has been begun on the study of the syntactical role of intonation in Turkmenian; the investigation of the syntactic structure of the Turkmenian language from a stadial-comparative standpoint has been begun (this covers mainly the vestiges of the possessive, locative, affective and ergative structures).

In lexicology: we are collecting material on folk terminology in certain trades and professions; a number of terminological dictionaries (geography, physics, chemistry, medicine, music, automobile, military, etc.) have been compiled; Turkmenian-Russian and Russian-Turkmenian dictionaries have been published; the role of international and Soviet elements in Turkmenian has been studied; the role of homonyms has been studied and a dictionary of homonyms has been compiled; the question of the structure and lexico-grammatical role of compound verbs has been the subject of research (nomino-verbal and compound verbal forms).

In the sphere of the palaeontology of speech: new sources of study have been

found in this field enabling us to throw light on the oldest period of sound speech (at the dawn of its existence) up to and including the incorporated (agglutinative) word-sentence.

In dialectology and dialectography: eight linguistic expeditions have been carried out during which recordings in phonetic transcription of extensive material of all the main dialects of the Turkmenian language and several minor dialects were made; the mutual relationships between Turkmenian dialects from a phonological, grammatical and partly from a lexical standpoint and short descriptions of the dialects have been written (with due allowance being made for the historical past of the Turkmenian people).

In addition to the purely linguistic work considerable attention has been paid to evolving methods of teaching the language in Turkmenian schools.

The theoretical research work of Turkmenian philologists has always gone along hand in hand with the practical side of our work, the compilation of text-books in Turkmenian for elementary and secondary schools. Almost a hundred works of this kind have been published.

The great patriotic war in which the peoples of the Soviet Union are now engaged has claimed some of the younger representatives of our Turkmenian philological school. Akhundov Gurgengi, a scientific worker of the Turkmenian Branch of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., and Begenjov, a post-graduate student of the Pedagogical Institute, died the death of heroes on the field of battle.

Nevertheless, even the vast war effort has not prevented the further growth and development of Turkmenian philological science, which is well aware of its duty to increase its effort and to make its labours fruitful.

A. POZELYEVSKY

ASHKHAHAD

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE MAIN WORKS ON THE TURKMENIAN LANGUAGE (1929-43)

I. *Phonology and Phonetics*

Потцелуевский, А. П., 'Фонетика туркменского языка.' Ашхабад, 1936.

Потцелуевский, А. П., 'Фонетический строй туркменского языка.' (Manuscript.)

II. *Morphology*

Азимов, П., 'Хэзирки туркмен Эдеи дилинде аффиксация аркалы сөзлерин ясалымы.' (The Affix as a Word-building Medium in Modern Literary Turkmenian.) (Manuscript.)

Байлыев, Х. М., 'Туркмен дилинин грамматикасынын гысга курсы.' (Short Course of Turkmenian Grammar.) Mimeographed by the Ashkhabad Pedagogical Institute, 1942.

Байлыев, Х., Исаков, М. Я., 'Учебник туркменского языка для русских.' Ашхабад, 1937.

Байлыев, Х. ве Гаррыев, Б., 'Руслар учин туркмен дилини өврениш китабы.' (Turkmenian for Russians.) 1st ed. Ashkhabad, 1931. 2nd ed. edited by Professor A. P. Potšelyuyevsky (in the Press.)

Bajlbeev, N. M. ve Sopbejev. 'Grammatika: Morphologija (sarf).' (Grammar: Morphology.) Ashkhabad, 1940.

Потцелуевский, А. П., 'Руководство для изучения туркменского языка.' Ашхабад, 1929.

Потцелуевский, А. П., 'Морфология туркменского языка в научном освещении.' Часть 1—синтаксические формы. (Manuscript.)

III. *Syntax*

Азымов, П. ве Байлыев, Х. 'Синтаксис.' Ашхабад, 1941.

Байлыев, Х., "'Дийип" хем "диен" формаларынын семантикасы ве шонын билен бирликде туркмен дилинде башганын сөзинин анладылмагы.' (Semantics of the forms 'diip' and 'dien' in Relation to Direct and Indirect Speech).

Попелуевский, А. П. 'Основы синтаксиса туркменского литературного языка.' Ашхабад, 1943.

Попелуевский, А. П., 'Әерженли, гошма сөзлемлерин дузулиши ве эмеле гелиши.' (Structure and Genesis of the Complex Subordinate Sentence.) Труды Туркменского Филиала Академии Наук СССР, вып. III. Ашхабад, 1942.

Höđrov, M. N., *Posleloglar hakında umumi maglumat.* (Notes on Postpositions.) Mimeographed by the Ashkhabad Pedagogical Institute, 1940.

Хыдыров, М. Н., 'Туркменин дилинин послелоглары ве оларын уланышлары.' (Turkmenian Postpositions and their Function.) (Manuscript.)

Хыдыров, М. Н., 'Туркмен дилинде "бир," сөзинин семантикасы ве онын грамматиканы роны.' (Semantics of the word 'bir' in Turkmenian and its Grammatical Functions.) (Manuscript.)

IV. *Lexicology*

Азымов, П., 'Туркмен дюлинде арап-парс элементарии.' (Arabo-Persian elements in Turkmenian.) Труды Туркменского филиала Академии Наук СССР, вып. III. Ашхабад, 1942.

Азымов, П., Хыдыров, А., ве Сакали, М. А., 'Харои терминлерин русчатуркменче сөзлуги.' (Russian-Turkmenian Dictionary of Military Terminology.) (In the Press.)

Байлыев, Х. М., 'Туркмен дилиндеки гошма ишликлер ве оларын семантики айратынлыклары.' (Compound Verbs in Turkmenian and the Peculiarities of their Semantics.) (Manuscript.)

Байлыев, Х. ве Азымов, П., 'Орфографик сөзлук.' (Orthographical Dictionary.) (In the Press.)

Байлыев, Х. ве Гаррыев, Б., 'Туркменче-русча сөзлук.'

Батыров, Ш., Карпов, Г. И., 'Русско-туркменский словарь.' (Рукопись.)

Кекилов, Аман, 'Туркмен дилиндеки совет-интернационал элементлери.' (Soviet and International Elements in Turkmenian.) (Manuscript.)

Кесев, М., 'Туркмен дилинин смонимлери.' (Homonyms in Turkmenian.) (Manuscript.)

Velmuradov, N., 'Nizarov, ata Oröscä-tyrkmençe qoşbnc6l6q terminologija sozligi.' (Russian-Turkmenian Dictionary of Military Terminology.) Ashkhabad-Baku, 1934.

V. *Paleontology of Speech*

Попелуевский, А. П., 'Новый источник для изысканий в области палеонтологин речи.' (Manuscript.)

VI. *Dialectology and Dialectography. The History of Turkmenian*

Попелуевский, А. П., 'Материалы по диалектам туркменского языка.' (Manuscript.)

Попелуевский, А. П., 'Диалекты туркменского языка.' Ашхабад, 1936 г.

Попелуевский, А. П., 'Туркмен дили ве онын шивелери.' (Turkmenian and its Dialects.) Mimeographed by the Ashkhabad Pedagogical Institute, 1943.

VII. *Methods of teaching Turkmenian*

Гурбанов, А., 'Клас ёлбашчыларына көмекчи.' (Teacher's Guide.) Ashkhabad, 1940.

Гурбанов, А., 'Туркмен мектеплеринде туркмен дилини окатмагын усулы.' (Methods of teaching Turkmenian in Turkmenian Schools.) (Manuscript.)

VIII. *Structure of the Language*

- Богданова, М. И., 'Основные вопросы терминологической работы в Туркмении.' Ашхабад, 1936.
- Рес ев, М., 'Тәзе туркмен элипоийини еврейненлере көмек.' (Guide to the New Turkmenian Alphabet.) Ashkhabad, 1940.
- Краткий русско-туркменский словарь 'социально-политических терминов. Под редакцией и с вступительной статьей М. И. Богдановой. Ашхабад, 1937.
- Попелуевский, А. П., 'Языковое строительство Туркмении и его основные проблемы.' Журнал 'Революция и национальности.' № 9, Москва, 1935.
- Попелуевский, А. П., 'Проект реформы орфографии туркменского литературного языка.' Ашхабад, 1936.
- Попелуевский, А. П., 'Правила орфографии туркменского литературного языка.' Ашхабад, 1937.
- Sopev, G., 'Orfografiya kadalar ve oňa gedişli genukmeler.' (Rules of Orthography and Orthographic Exercises.) Ashkhabad, 1937.
- Sopev, G., 'Tyrkmenistan I-nçi konferensijasınň edebi dil, adaloja hem imla dogrýsında çäqaran qararlar.' (Decisions of the 1st Turkmenian Scientific Conference on the Literary Language, Terminology and Orthography.) Ashkhabad, 1930.
- Sopev, G., 'Tyrkmenistan I-nçi lingvistik gurultajınň rezolýtsijalar.' (Resolutions of the 1st Turkmenian Linguistic Conference.) Ashkhabad, 1937.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTE

A NOTE ON 'THE PARDONER'S TALE', LINES 237-239

It has been recognized that in the following lines of *The Pardoner's Tale*,

This wyn of Spayne crepeth subtilly
In other wynes, growing faste by,
Of which ther ryseth swich fumositee, (C 565-7)

'Chaucer is writing of the wines as if they were vine-shoots' (Drennan and Wyatt). Chaucer humorously explains that Spanish wine is found mixed with French wine, not because of the deliberate adulteration carried out by vintners, but because of the subtle manner in which the vine-shoots of Spanish vineyards get mixed up with those of French vineyards lying near. Commentators (Drennan and Wyatt) have pointed out that the joke is evident from the use of the words 'growing' and 'crepeth' with reference to wine. I would suggest that it is even more evident from the use of the words 'wyn' and 'wynes' in the passage.

Initial *v-* for initial *w-* (and *w-* for *v-*) is, according to Professor Wyld (in *A Short History of English*, 1927, p. 210), a characteristic of early modern English and is proved by 'occasional spellings' to have been in use in London from the middle of the fifteenth century. The earliest 'occasional spelling' given by Professor Wyld is *valkyng* (= walking) from Bokenam (1443). Londoners of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries like Gregory (Lord Mayor of London) and Machyn use 'occasional spellings' that indicate the continuance of the use of *v-* for *w-*. Professor Wyld has himself suggested and admitted the possibility (ibid. p. 208) that many early modern consonantal changes including this are 'probably far older than the date of the earliest example given' by him, and that fourteenth-century records might reveal this but for their 'greater adherence to traditional spelling'. It is therefore reasonable to assume that the use of initial *v-* for *w-* and of initial *w-* for *v-* was a feature of London English even in Chaucer's days, and that, taking advantage of this, Chaucer resorted to a pun on 'Wine' and 'Vine' in the passage under discussion. Chaucer's Pardoner was a Londoner, belonging as he did to 'Rouncivale', Charing Cross, and the pronunciation underlying the pun would have been natural in the case of the Pardoner. Perhaps Chaucer was, like Shakespeare, a lover of puns.

S. KRISHNAMURTI

ANNAMALAI, S. INDIA

REVIEWS

English Literary Criticism: The Medieval Phase. By J. W. H. ATKINS. Cambridge: University Press. 1943. ix+211 pp. 12s. 6d.

One might well describe Professor Atkins's two volumes on *Literary Criticism in Antiquity* and the present volume as indispensable prolegomena to the study of English literary criticism. This is their nature. The earlier work, comprehensive and well-nigh exhaustive in its analysis and treatment of the technical detail, the speculative riches, the psychological insight, and the judicial perspicacity of classical literary doctrine, is invaluable for the proper study of literature and theory from the Tudors to the Georges. The significance and impact of the Renaissance are thereby more adequately understood. The present volume has a less promising field. The interest of medieval English criticism may appear to be rather historical than aesthetic. It is true that one will look in vain for the philosophic power and clear vision of the ancients and for much originality in theory; it will not be easy to escape the feeling that, apart from the more obvious post-classical and patristic influences, critical activity in medieval England is largely a 'groping for light'. But no survey of English criticism can rightly refuse to pass lightly over these beginnings which form 'an integral part of the native critical tradition'.

This volume has all the virtues of its predecessors, combining sufficient fullness with lucidity of statement and convincing argument. Within the limits that the author has set for himself, the work could hardly have been better done. The introductory chapter and the immediately following sketch of the medieval inheritance supply the necessary background to the subject—the attitude of the Roman hierarchy towards literature; the place of literature in religious and secular education; the allegorical tradition; the dependence of medieval rhetoric on the base standards of the Second Sophistic, with its abandonment of the nobler conceptions of classical criticism, on the endless minutiae of stylistic distinctions, and on the metrical and stylistic discussions of post-classical grammarians who tended to regard poetry as versified rhetoric; the intermittent and somewhat casual appearance of criticism in medieval England; and the undefined position of the vernacular in relation to Latin as a recognized literary medium.

It is with the seventh-century Latin revival that English criticism begins—with the muddled treatise of Aldhelm on the hexameter, and with the elementary orthographical and metrical text-books of Bede, and with his work on *Figures and Tropes in Holy Writ*, which books, for all their interest and influence, are deficient in true literary judgement. Alcuin's treatises *On Grammar* (technical and mechanical in conception) and *On Rhetoric* (largely indebted to the unoriginal and immature *De Inventione* of Cicero) are in no way profound, but were doubtless a useful specific against the prevailing illiteracy of the time; his work *On Orthography*, slightly treated here, is of some considerable interest to the Latin palaeographer.

A long interval of comparative darkness followed, and it was only with the growth of Humanism in the twelfth century and the appearance of John of Salisbury's discursive *Policraticus* and analytical *Metalogicon* that critical thought shines forth again. He claims for literature its rightful place in a liberal education, and, besides investigating and expounding the basic requirements of good, artistic writing, 'makes illuminating pronouncements' on classical literature which, though not always original, but often palpably derivative, served to promote familiarity with some of the valuable features of the classical tradition. His work 'represented the first challenge of Humanism on English soil, opening up fresh possibilities of thought and expression'; and his approving comments on contemporaries such as Bernard of Chartres and his shrewd attacks on the philistine Cornificiani testify

to the working of the new spirit. In this century, too, the new literary activity that saw a growing output of Latin and vernacular poetry provided a fresh stimulus to poetical criticism. The *Poetria Nova* of Geoffrey de Vinsauf and the *Poetria* of John Garland, which show the marked influence of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and traces of Horace, attempt to 'treat poetry as an art, with definite principles and rules, and with formal perfection as the ultimate ideal'. Their work seems to the modern mind pedantically formal and elaborately superficial, because of the rhetorical texture of its poetic theory. The summary of this type of theorizing given in an appendix, with the triple division into the methods of beginning and ending a poem, the methods of amplification and abbreviation, and the ornaments of style, consisting of tropes and figures of speech and thought, clearly shows the manner of this complicated technique, which, however uninspired it may appear and however far removed it may be from the appreciation of the true processes and effects of poetry, had a not inconsiderable influence on courtly love-poetry and, among other poets, Chaucer.

The new Logic and Scholasticism of the thirteenth century arrested the growth of Humanism. But Grosseteste and Roger Bacon, by their several interests in scholarship, textual criticism, accurate translation of the classics, and unaffectedness of style, and later Richard of Bury, by his genuine and profound enthusiasm for letters, kept alive the Humanistic spirit. The next century brought a fresh development in the emergence of English as the literary medium and in attempts to adapt vernacular literature to medieval poetic. Already early in the previous century *The Owl and the Nightingale* had offered what was virtually a criticism of the 'relative value of the old traditional didactic themes and the new love themes of the Troubadours as subject-matter for poetry'. The argument there is mainly ethical, but aesthetic considerations are not wholly ignored. Wiclif's open challenge to the false rhetoric that had coloured medieval literature laid the foundations of good English prose. Chaucer, critical alike of society and (though not explicitly) of the traditional mechanics of medieval poetic, is manifestly seeking to free poetry from hampering formalism. The parody of rhyming romances in the *Tale of Sir Thopas*, the covert criticism of Geoffrey de Vinsauf in *Nun's Priest's Tale*, the indirect pleading against the prevailing poetic conventions of style in several passages in the *Tales*, the conception of tragedy in *The Monk's Tale*, reveal a mind constructive but still limited. Yet the efforts of Wiclif and Chaucer were partly unavailing. The false goddess Rhetoric reared her head again. Imitation of Italian Humanism and the influence of Lydgate led to the pursuit of highly ornamented, image-laden style, and the complaints of Caxton and Skelton show the depth of the inroads of this aureate diction. This age, however, produced the first English attempts to expound the nature of poetry, and, though the results are meagre, Hawes and Skelton have the credit of taking the first steps in this direction; and for the first time the doctrine of poetic inspiration is set forth in English.

Such are some of the leading topics of this book, but so brief an epitome can give no adequate impression of the wealth of detail that is here to satisfy the scholar and to delight the student. Not least valuable is the wholly admirable concluding chapter in which are passed in review the main achievements of English medieval criticism. The reader who studies this work with the thoroughness that it deserves will be unable to deny the truth of Professor Atkins's conclusions that 'some knowledge of the prevailing literary theory is indispensable for the proper understanding of medieval poetic technique... and thus conduces to a more intelligent reading of medieval literature generally'. Such knowledge will correct the misleading conception of English medieval literature as 'essentially a spontaneous development'. Nor should the reader fail to welcome the timely and valuable reminder that medieval ideas survived into the Tudor and Elizabethan Ages not only in literary theory but also in literature itself. He will not overvalue the intrinsic qualities of

medieval criticism but will see it in its true perspective. When a historian of literary theory can achieve so much, he has earned the praise that is his.

J. F. LOCKWOOD

LONDON

Art and Reality. By F. O. NOLTE. Lancaster, Pa.: Lancaster Press. 1942. 188 pp. \$2.00.

Mr Nolte takes up an important theme of his earlier book, *Lessing's Laokoon*,¹ by again stressing the essential difference between art and other forms of the imagination. It is because he sees through the 'imaginative lens of his medium' that the artist differs from other men of vision. The source of his special insight is his power to shape. But if art thus consists in 'what the artist can do with his medium', it is not in the narrow sense of art for art's sake. The author's view of art is as robust as it is sensitive, and he avoids the pitfall of pure form by insisting on a distinction between the merely physical properties, and the aesthetic values, of medium. To represent a cube rather than a cabbage is not to make painting more 'pure' but to confuse the sensuous with the merely sensory. And because for the musician 'everything is sound' this does not mean that sound is everything. Indeed, form *as such* is but an intellectual abstraction; to be aesthetic it must be inextricably interwoven with content.

In his concern to establish the relatedness of art and life Mr Nolte now abandons his earlier unfortunate contention that the impressions we receive from art are altogether different from those of actual experience. Instead, he urges that 'because art has little to do with our ordinary or routine emotions is no reason to exclude our rarer ones', thus recognizing that the aesthetic consciousness embraces far more than the merely artistic. Consciousness, in fact, is the new theme of this book, its key-concept, as the author himself maintains. Nature, history, science, art, are all aspects of consciousness. The enlightened thing is not to reserve the term reality for the aspect we ourselves may favour, but to recognize each for what it is. For, although we cannot disregard even the meanest aspect of reality without dislocating the whole, this does not mean that all experience is equally vital. If of all contexts the aesthetic is deemed the highest, it is because it challenges the whole of man's nature to respond. He may not always be able to keep this total consciousness alert, but he should be able to summon it at important times for ultimate reference.

His justifiable anxiety to restore to the world that aesthetic attitude which he finds embodied in Plato leads Mr Nolte to certain errors of judgement. He is unfair to Schiller who, faced with the fragmentary aspects of consciousness of our modern civilization, likewise sought to restore the totality of man's nature through the aesthetic. Who, if not Schiller, would agree with Mr Nolte that art is 'the most comprehensive, most intense and most enduring form of human consciousness'? And of Thomas Mann's Tonio Kröger it can scarcely be maintained that he is a true heir of the poet's romantic isolation: he begins by being a victim of its confusion, but ends as the prophet of a new age. More disturbing than these literary preconceptions, however, is Mr Nolte's rejection of the modern world as a subject for poetry. It is not enough to protest, as he does, that we are imaginatively out of touch with our mechanized environment—what is required is a reorientation to it. A tank is poetical as soon as it becomes the object of poetic experience. The sailing ship, too, was once a machine born of the calculation of engineers. To assume that there is an essential difference between the sloop and the tank shows a lack of historic perspective. Mr Nolte recognizes that there is beauty in a plane

¹ Reviewed in *Mod. Lang. Rev.* April 1942.

as it shoots aloft, but argues that the over-rapid evolution of its form and its mass production must prevent it being sung by the poet. Let an air pilot refute him!

Have you looked at a modern aeroplane? Have you followed from year to year the evolution of its lines?... In appearance, but only in appearance, do engineers, physicists... the swarm of preoccupied draughtsmen seem to be polishing surfaces and refining away angles, easing this joint or stabilizing that wing, rendering these parts invisible, so that in the end there is no longer a wing hooked to a framework but a form flawless in its perfection, completely disengaged from its matrix, a sort of spontaneous whole, its parts mysteriously fused together and resembling in their unity a poem.¹

Nevertheless, this is a book one wants to come back to, for its warmth and delicacy of feeling as for the astringent clarity of its thought. Mr Nolte has a genius for careful distinction, and he here offers much-needed resistance to many an ensnaring confusion. As he himself claims, many of the most persistent and pernicious of traditional problems tend to dwindle, if not to disappear, once it is realized that, although distinctive contexts of experience may be compared, they must not be confused.

ELIZABETH M. WILKINSON

LONDON

Problems of Spelling Reform. By WILLIAM A. CRAIGIE. (S.P.E. Tract, LXIII.) Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1944. 32 pp. 3s. 6d.

In his manual on *English Spelling, Its Rules and Reasons* (1927), and in his earlier Tract on *Some Anomalies of Spelling* (1942), Sir William Craigie has already produced two authoritative studies which must continue to claim the very serious attention of every seeker after reform. Now, in the Tract before us, he deals with these problems direct. He examines their implications with consummate skill and care. Gently and sympathetically he warns the innovator against snares and pitfalls. At the same time, he is no obdurate conservative. With all its proved excellence, its long history and its manifest advantages, our present spelling is, in his opinion, not sacrosanct. Before the systematic examination of suggested reforms, which comprises the second and main part of his paper, he reviews the problems as they affect the printer, the ordinary reader, the English-speaking child and the foreign student. Perhaps it would be the highest praise to say of this essay that it is comparable with Henry Bradley's indispensable paper *On the relations between Spoken and Written Language with special reference to English* (1919), which, as a clear and simple presentation of a most complex series of problems, is never likely to be superseded.

Advocates of spelling reform have failed in the past, not only because they have found their fellow-countrymen indifferent and lethargic, but also because they have themselves minimized or ignored practical difficulties. Over seventy years ago, members of a learned society drew up an 'imposing body of testimony' in favour of reform. The Simplified Spelling Society was founded in 1908, and it is still (we believe) in existence. From time to time an eminent man of letters, like Robert Bridges, has ventured to publish his work in a modified spelling which has won no small recognition and approval. Many people are vaguely aware that something could and should be done to bring our written language into closer accord with the 'noises' or spoken sounds. Fresh attempts will doubtless be made in the reconstructed world of to-morrow. It is the purpose of this Tract to show that such endeavours will be unprofitable if their promoters assume certain things too readily. So, for example, they should not take it for granted that the relationship between sound and symbol is of immediate and vital importance to the

¹ A. de Saint-Exupéry, *Wind, Sand and Stars*, Heinemann, 1939, pp. 53 ff.

ordinary reader (when it is shown every day that it is not), or that boys and girls in school have the same feeling for this relationship as their adult teachers. Would children find self-expression easier if they were taught to write *cats* but *dogz* and *horsez*; *jumps* but *runz* and *rizez*; and *jumpt* but *turnd* and *landed*? Would the foreign student like to find whole sections of his English vocabulary divorced from their counterparts in those European languages with one or other of which he is probably acquainted? To give but one example, if *c* were retained for *capital*, *colony* and *custom*, then some such forms as *senter*, *sertin* and *sirkel* would have to replace *centre*, *certain* and *circle*. As for the 'notorious -ough- group', that butt of so much ridicule and obloquy, no completely satisfactory solution has ever been found. American *plow* is old and good, but are *bough* and *slough* to be written *bow* and *slow*? American *thru* is brief, but it is without analogy. Epistolary, *tho'* is useful, but the apostrophe is irregular. Even the elimination of final -e, when it does not perform any function by denoting a long vowel or a diphthong, cannot be universally applied, although it might well be dropped in words like *infinite* and *doctrine*, even as it has already been discarded in *deposit* and *fossil*. Indeed, it is in such slight and less ambitious changes that Sir William sees the fairest chances of success in the near future. Little by little, words like *horror* and *terror*, *music* and *physick*, *chymical* and *chymist*, have assumed their present forms. Gradually these new spellings, now fully established, have won general acceptance. Such changes may surely be continued and extended with advantage. *Fantasy* is superseding *phantasy*. *Tarmigan* may well replace unetymological *ptarmigan*. If such changes are admitted, there must be a transition period during which many more words have two recognized 'correct' spellings side by side. Certainly the number of such words is already more considerable than the casual observer might suppose.

SIMEON POTTER

SOUTHAMPTON

The Legends of Ermanaric. By CAROLINE BRADY. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press; London: Cambridge University Press. 1943. xii + 341 pp. 18s.

This book, by an Assistant Professor of English in the University of California, is an elaborate study of the stories which have gathered round the name of Ermanarik. The author deals with the matter by countries—Norse, Danish, Anglo-Saxon and German—and summarizes results in a concluding chapter. She has studied the extensive literature of the subject, documented her work exhaustively, and is not afraid to be independent in her conclusions. It is evident that many of these must be highly controversial and will provoke criticism and dissent. She discusses or touches innumerable problems, some of them fundamental problems, of Teutonic heroic poetry, and all that can be done here is to call attention to her book as an earnest and honest attempt to face the difficulties in the light of the available evidence, to indicate the line of approach in general, and to add a few comments on particular points.

The main thesis may be stated as an attempt to prove that the Svanhild-story is exclusively Norse. Completely unknown in Anglo-Saxon England and in earlier German tradition, it was independently developed in Scandinavia, from thence penetrated into Denmark, and further, whether directly or not, into north Germany. References to the story in the *Quedlinburg Annals*, in Ekkehard's *Chronicon Universale*, or versions of it as in Saxo, *Thithrekssaga*, and the Dutch *Erminrikes Dot*, all come in the end from Scandinavia. It is a fact that there is no trustworthy evidence of its existence outside Scandinavia, apart from Jordanes. Others share the author's scepticism on the value of proper names in proof of acquaintance with the story, and especially of the existence of poems with the story as subject. Such

evidence can be demonstrative in particular cases, but certainly not in the cases which occur. If Professor Brady could find a plausible explanation of the route by which the story reached Scandinavia between A.D. 450 and 550, and some grounds to justify her belief in the practice of heroic poetry in the primitive Norse period, her views would have more weight. In *Widsith* we have a pretty complete account of Teutonic heroic figures, at all events those of north-western Europe, and there is not a Norwegian among them; the only Swede occurs in the list of kings, comes from the Beowulf-cycle, and his memory had so completely disappeared in Sweden that not a demonstrable trace remains. The emergence of large princely courts in Scandinavia is not early, and it is there, so far as our evidence shows, that heroic poetry was cultivated. In such is its natural home. These considerations are not favourable to the assumption of a developed heroic poetry in early Scandinavian times. Nor is it easy to see how the story got to Scandinavia except by the intermediary of German tradition. The early references there cannot be just dismissed as borrowed and distorted, differences between them and the Norse accounts explained away, nor yet divergent but apparently primitive traces in the Dutch poem set contemptuously aside. Professor Brady has an explanation for most of the difficulties which emerge but, though a little offhand in dismissing the considered judgement of some very distinguished scholars, her work is more valuable in the sphere of criticism than construction. Detailed analysis of *Hamðismál* is inevitable in a book so largely occupied with the story of Svanhild, and her interpretation of that difficult poem, in essentials as previously set forth in vol. 55 of *P.M.L.A.*, is restated here.

R. GIVAN

GLASGOW

The Book of Vices and Virtues. Edited by W. NELSON FRANCIS. (Early English Text Society, 217.) London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1942. lxxxii + 378 pp. 52s. 6d.

This book fully maintains the high standard of recent Early English Text Society publications, and fills an important gap in Middle English literature. A translation of the *Somme le Roi* by the thirteenth-century Dominican friar, Lorens d'Orléans, it is a fourteenth-century Midland text parallel to Dan Michel's Kentish *Ayenbite of Inwyrt* and seven other versions before Caxton's *Royal Book* in c. 1486. Of less linguistic interest and difficulty than its Kentish analogue, it will be (as it is intended to be) of great value to those wishing to follow up Dr Owst's work on *Preaching in Medieval England*, and have in their possession additional illustrative material. We are invited by the editor to pass judgement on the book from this angle—that of its degree of usefulness to those primarily interested in popular theology and vernacular religious instruction in the later Middle Ages. Dr Francis has admirably succeeded in his purpose, for he has equipped his text with explanatory notes taking us back to the French version wherever necessary, and drawing brief but important parallels and divergencies from the *Ayenbite*. In the Introduction we have a brief account of the French original, its author and sources, which is well documented but rather summary in treatment, and is very much more concerned with the author himself than with his work. The account of the unprinted English versions which follows is by force of circumstances inadequate. The editor has not been able to study these MSS. except for a page or two of each in rotograph which must be an unsatisfactory basis for the conclusion that each is independent of the others, as the editor himself admits. But we know enough of these versions to realize that their intrinsic value is small in comparison with the text now made available. They are often incomplete and careless, and for practical purposes are not worth printing.

For the present more important text the editor has taken as his basis the MS. now in the possession of the Huntington Library with collations of the two MSS. in the British Museum. We have thus the earliest and undoubtedly the best text made available to us. Linguistically the work is of interest as a good specimen of East Midland of the fourth quarter of the fourteenth century. In particular, the good state of preservation of the singular and plural forms of the preterite of Ablaut verbs is noteworthy at this period. In his interpretation of linguistic data, however, Dr Francis does not pay sufficient attention to recent work upon the subject, especially that of the group of workers in this field in Michigan. Generalizations are made without warrant, and the editor makes little attempt to collate the dialect of his three versions, especially in the matter of relationship to the dialect of the original which in all probability was much nearer to the north. The Huntington MS. represents a mixed text as well as a mixed dialect, which takes value from such statements as, 'The most likely possibility seems to be the strip which extends from the eastern boundary of Oxfordshire to the western boundary of Essex, including southern Bucks, southern Herts, Middlesex and London, perhaps also northern Surrey', especially in view of the fact that the linguistic evidence for date points to the very end of the fourteenth century or at least not earlier than c. 1390. A much fuller investigation of the dialect of MS. Addit. 22283 with its apparently south-west Midland complexion was needed. But this work now made available will prove of great value to the wider audience for which it was intended.

J. P. OAKDEN

ST ANDREWS

Shakespearean Comedy and other Studies. By GEORGE GORDON. London: Oxford University Press. 1944. vii + 158 pp. 7s. 6d.

Disjecta membra poetæ. There was that creative quality in the late Professor George Gordon which justifies the name of poet, together with a joy in style which expressed his own kindling of the imagination in the contemplation and enjoyment of great literature. It is not a guide who is missed among us; it is a soul and mind astir, in its own right, upon good occasion. This selection from Gordon's writings has been supervised by Sir Edmund Chambers, after preliminary work by Dr Chapman, Dr Onions, and Mr New, and it is of equal value and delight, an ample reward for pious labours. Whatever Gordon said or wrote was the expression of an original mind, the outcome of appreciation at first hand. It is surprising indeed that a man should be capable of so fresh and new a treatment of an endlessly discussed play like *The Tempest*, or be able to approach *King Lear* as if it were the first sunset ever seen by man.

George Gordon had but little respect for 'the moles' of literary science, his term for the professional researcher and the pedant. He had his prejudices. Yet he has his own say upon *Batman's Bartolome* and the *Book of Sidrach*, to very good effect, in his interpretation of *King Lear*, to supplement the deficiencies of those 'moles', the commentators. And, after all, we cannot so lightly dismiss the copy for *The Tempest*, as a play preserving the Unities (p. 86), without taking into account Professor Dover Wilson's close analysis of the text, wherein he argues that much of this may have been the work of an abridger and not the design of Shakespeare. Science and good taste, said Walter Pater, go to the making of a good critic. And there is perhaps too facile a readiness to accept, for example, the identity of Tarlton with Spenser's 'pleasant Willy' in *The Teares of the Muses* (p. 68). Zest and wit shine out alike throughout these writings, even on the printed page which is deprived of the advantage of Gordon's inimitable voice and presence. It can have occurred to no other individual to observe a contrast between Prospero and Napoleon (p. 82), or to observe the late emergence of the 'Mother-in-law joke'

(p. 67). But surely it is an error to think of More providing in his *Utopia* for 'professional' fools (p. 60); the context points plainly to 'natural' fools.

There are occasional misprints, e.g. *O* for *Of* (p. 58.) It is interesting to observe Gordon's repetitions and second thoughts, e.g. in a comparison of a passage on p. 46 and again on pp. 93-4 about Prospero's island, where, like Shakespeare, he pillages himself. Would that he could, in due course, have pillaged the concluding essay on 'Shakespeare's English' for the book on 'Shakespeare's language' that he had begun to write (p. 141) but did not live to achieve.

C. J. SISSON

LONDON

Shakespeare and the Nature of Man. By THEODORE SPENCER. Cambridge: University Press. 1943. xii+233 pp. 18s.

Professor Theodore Spencer has set himself a task of the greatest scope and difficulty: 'It is Shakespeare's vision of life we are after,' he says in his Preface, 'its dependence on contemporary thought, its development through dramatic form, and its universal truth.'

No real attempt to criticize his learned and closely wrought argument is possible here. Even to summarize his argument would require more paper than present conditions allow. The following notes indicate merely the main drift of his work.

What Professor Spencer here calls contemporary thought is dealt with in two chapters. The first he heads 'The Optimistic Theory':

Nature rules over all; her order is manifest in the heavens, in created beings, in the state, and it is man's business, not only to comprehend it, but to see that it is maintained...since all three domains form a single unity and are interdependent, the best way to grasp any one of them is to compare it with one or both of the others...the king, says du Bartas, is placed in the center of his realm, just as the sun is set in the middle of the heavens, and as man's heart is placed in the middle of his body...the whole universe, which was made for man, found in man its reflection and its epitome; man was the center of the ideal picture which optimistic theory delighted to portray.

Ulysses's speech on order, in *Troilus and Cressida*, emphasizes the unity of the three interrelated hierarchies.

The next chapter is called 'The Renaissance Conflict'. So closely is all linked up that man's fall corrupted the rest of creation. Here was a basic conflict between man's dignity and wretchedness. But this conflict could by the doctrine of grace and redemption be solved. But a further conflict introduced by Renaissance thought has now to be considered:

belief in each one of the interrelated orders—cosmological, natural and 'political'—... was being punctured by a doubt. Copernicus had questioned the cosmological order, Montaigne had questioned the natural order, Machiavelli had questioned the political order....At the time when Shakespeare's development as a craftsman reached its climax, this conflict also reached its climax, and...Shakespeare, practising the type of writing which relies on conflict, was able to use it.

This conflict was sharpened by the Religious and Political troubles of the age. Again, for the earlier humanists man belonged with the angels, for later writers like Montaigne with the beasts. Here was a violation of an accepted order felt throughout the whole structure.

It was because Shakespeare, as he developed his art, was able to see individual experience in relation to the all-inclusive conflict produced by this violation, that his great tragedies have such wide reverberations and give us so profound a picture of the nature of man.

In his third chapter Professor Spencer studies

the development in the sixteenth century and in Shakespeare's own early plays, of the particular dramatic technique which enabled him to use... the deep conflict about man's nature which was given him by his age.

On the pattern of the morality play which passes into the tradition of the Elizabethan drama, he notes:

First we have an account of the optimistic picture of what man ought to be, we are then shown how man is led astray by the lower part of his nature, and finally we have a reconciliation between man and the ruler of the universe.

This threefold division is later applied to Shakespearian tragedy.

Summing up on the historical plays Professor Spencer concludes:

Such is the general plan of all Shakespeare's historical plays, as it was of the moralities, and as it is of the later tragedies—as it is, in fact, of all drama that has deep roots in the beliefs and conventions of its time. An existing order is violated, the consequent conflict and turmoil are portrayed, and order is restored by the destruction of the force or forces that originally violated it.

The next step in Shakespeare's development is anticipated in the comment on *Romeo and Juliet*:

The tragedy of *Romeo and Juliet*, unlike the later tragedies, is an external tragedy, and no matter how splendidly Shakespeare may see it in relation to the conventional belief in the influence of the stars on mankind, he does not make that belief, or the explosion of that belief, as he was to do later, a part of his analysis of character. *Romeo and Juliet*, unlike *Hamlet* and *Othello*, are 'whole-souled', and though a knowledge of sixteenth-century views of man may help us to see how Shakespeare thought of their tragedy, they themselves are not aware of how their actions and what happens to them violate the accepted beliefs. *Romeo's* tragedy is caused by the stars above him, and he has to be told by an external commentator what is wrong with his passions... In the later tragedies the views they expound, the conventions which they embody externally, are put by Shakespeare *inside* the consciousness of his heroes and heroines... it is something which can tear a soul apart in pieces, as it tears the souls of *Hamlet* and *Lear*.

Chapters iv, v, and vi treat of this inner conflict in the tragedies. There is again the threefold division, but as the conflict has become more inward so is the reconciliation. 'The last time we know *Hamlet* emotionally, he has transcended his own situation... We have seen the purgation of a soul.'

The last plays occupy Chapter vii:

The emphasis in the tragedies is on evil and the struggle with evil, and the reconciliation, such as it is, occupies only a small part of the action or the thought. In the last plays... it is the reconciliation that is emphasised and dwelt on.

In his final chapter Professor Spencer indicates how the historian of ideas must try to relate the patterns he discovers in Shakespeare's plays to a wider context that will 'transcend any view that we can obtain by thinking of his work merely in relation to the ideas of his time'.

To consider the argument further, and especially the central chapters dealing with the tragedies, is unfortunately impossible at present; and this notice must conclude with a comment on three more trivial points. On p. 32 Professor Spencer speaks as if he had not read Miss Yates's important study of *Love's Labour's Lost*; on p. 75, note 19, as if he had not seen Professor Dover Wilson's edition of *Richard II*; and on p. 100, note 5, with a confidence that I feel might be modified if he attempted to prove his assertion.

Professor Spencer's work should be read in conjunction with Mr Tillyard's *Elizabethan World Picture*, and one may venture to repeat the comment of that

scholar on the learning and charm with which Professor Spencer has developed his theme.

PETER ALEXANDER

GLASGOW

The Fortunes of Falstaff. By J. DOVER WILSON. Cambridge: University Press. 1943. viii + 143. 6s.

Every student of Shakespeare will welcome Professor Dover Wilson's *The Fortunes of Falstaff*, and the excuse it gives for re-reading 1 and 2 *Henry IV*. The volume contains the substance of the Clark lectures for 1943, and is the outcome of Professor Dover Wilson's present preoccupation with 1 and 2 *Henry IV*, which are to take their place, at not too distant a date it may be hoped, in the ranks of the New Cambridge Shakespeare.

As the author reminds us, the problem to which he here addresses himself is but a particular instance of a general aesthetic problem that is again troubling students of Milton. And just as some students of Milton are for putting Satan in his place again, the place they consider Milton designed for him and from which lawless Romantics have tried to deliver him, so Professor Dover Wilson would deal with Falstaff, who is, he judges, a devil, though now disguised as a fat old man.

Here too then '*Falstaff* is the word only, *Shakespeare* is the *Theme*'; and Professor Dover Wilson's interpretation of the theme is different from that now generally accepted. Mr Granville Barker, in his *From Henry V to Hamlet*, distinguished what he called the complaisant side and the daemonic side in Shakespeare's genius. Just before Shakespeare was able to give full scope in his great tragedies to his real genius, there is a period in which there are plays that exhibit the two sides in something like conflict. *The Merchant of Venice* is one. It is useless to try to cover up the strife by saying that Shylock is the real hero and that the gentlemen of Venice are good-for-nothing spongers; or to take the other side and denounce Shylock as merely a bloody-minded usurer. The work lacks the unity of the great masterpieces; and requires for its interpretation the larger context of the plays taken as a whole. *Henry IV* is usually regarded as a play of this period. The ground plan of these plays is as clearly traced as that of *The Merchant of Venice*; but while this is largely the work of the complaisant Shakespeare, and laid out with all the judgement and spaciousness we should expect from one of his great talent, the daemonic genius of the man in the course of construction found opportunities for developing with wonderful skill certain features in a way not adequately allowed for when the fundamental lines were drawn. There is therefore a shift or a division of emphasis in the finished structure.

But Professor Dover Wilson is not prepared to accept what he characterizes as merely tactful apologies for Shakespeare's working in two minds. It is the critics, so he contends, who are in two minds, because they are unwilling to accept the play for what it really is, 'Shakespeare's great morality play'. It is to establishing this conclusion, therefore, that Professor Dover Wilson develops the argument. 'Prince Hal is the prodigal, and his repentance is not only to be taken seriously, it is to be admired and commended.'

Professor Dover Wilson, needless to say, makes the most of all the passages that support such an opinion. And as there is no doubt that what may be called the formal intention of the play was to please the public with some such picture of their hero, Shakespeare has provided him with many excellent points. That Shakespeare's sympathies lay with the soldier who was less petulant and childish than Hotspur but as brave, with the leader who dispensed with the politic devices of Bolingbroke but not with his foresight and steadfastness, is hardly to be denied. All that he can do to make his argument unassailable Professor Wilson has

done, except to show how it fits into a better conception of the development of Shakespeare's genius than that now current. For the views long held by many distinguished critics, and restated in his own way by Mr Granville Barker, will no longer suffice, if Professor Dover Wilson's argument is accepted in its entirety. For though his title is *The Fortunes of Falstaff*, it is our understanding and enjoyment of Shakespeare that is at issue.

Till Professor Dover Wilson completes this background for the foreground he has laid in so decisively, criticism of detail may go far astray. But perhaps one long attached to Maurice Morgann's masterpiece may venture on an observation, especially as Professor Dover Wilson seems to dismiss Morgann with less consideration than he deserves.

It might be objected to Professor Dover Wilson's interpretation that Shakespeare's prodigal prince is never a true prodigal, or that he is a much more business-like traveller into a far country than his anonymous predecessor. Could we imagine the prodigal preface his departure with a statement which would assure us that he was going to enjoy just enough riotous living to make his father glad to see him home again, we should be nearer Prince Hal's case. Instead of the almost insupportable pathos of the great parable we have something which is, to borrow Bagehot's phrase, a political transaction; and such transactions are hard to fit into the ideal world of poetry and drama. What Milton and Vergil could not do for all their art, Shakespeare does not accomplish in *Henry IV*. The political necessities of the affair between God and Satan or Aeneas and Dido, though abundantly clear to our understanding, have not the instinctive rightness that alone can satisfy the imagination in the highest poetry. And Prince Hal has to play the politician in his last scene as in his first. Indeed, if the prodigal analogy were to be pressed, it might be Falstaff rather than Henry who would fill the protagonist's role. In a very interesting passage Professor Dover Wilson shows how Shakespeare has linked the prodigal's story with Falstaff's. For example, in the *Merry Wives of Windsor* (only admitted as evidence in such secondary matters) his room in the Garter is painted with the parable. And certainly if we want a picture of humanity enjoying itself in a far country and tasting the bliss that brings forgetfulness for a time at least, Falstaff is a more likely model than the Prince.

PETER ALEXANDER

GLASGOW

John Milton's Complete Poetical Works reproduced in photographic facsimile.

A critical text edition compiled and edited by HARRIS FRANCIS FLETCHER.

Volume I [*Minor Poems*]. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. 1943. 465 pp. 11 × 8½ in. \$20.00.

This book is designed as a facsimile reproduction of all the relevant textual authorities for Milton's minor poems combined with an apparatus that shall establish (by a comparison of copies wherever several are available) the exact reading of each original and exhibit in detail the variants between different editions, and the scheme is one that cannot fail to interest all textual students. Success in the execution must depend, on the material side, on the adequacy of the method of reproduction, and on the editorial side, on the completeness with which the textual evidence is collected, and the knowledge and intelligence with which it is presented and interpreted. In view of the great labour and considerable expense that must have gone to the preparation of this volume, it is disappointing to have to report that, while whatever care and patience could achieve Mr Fletcher has achieved, in other respects it hardly justifies itself. Work of this kind depends almost entirely on technical considerations of method and equipment, and the criticism of it cannot

avoid being equally technical: there are, however, one or two remarks of a more general character that should first be made.

To begin with, readers must be warned that, in spite of the title-page, the present is not a critical edition, if by that we understand one in which variant readings are not merely collected but their value assessed. Of the latter there is nothing in Mr Fletcher's pages; he is content to gather the materials without attempting the task of evaluation.¹ Another warning must be that there is in the writing a want of lucidity and logical coherence that makes it difficult always to be sure of interpreting the intention correctly. This puts a reviewer at a disadvantage: it is possible that I have sometimes done Mr Fletcher injustice through failure to grasp his meaning.

Fugitive pieces apart, the present volume includes, in order, reproductions of the *Poems English and Latin* of 1673 and 1645, the 1637 *Comus* with the Ellesmere manuscript, the 1638 *Lycidas*, the undated print of the *Epitaphium Damonis*, the verse portions of the Trinity manuscript (reproduced, including Aldis Wright's transcript, from the Cambridge Press facsimile), and the Rouse verses in the Bodleian. The whole is printed by the 'photo-offset' process, mostly in line, though half-tone is used for most of the manuscript material and the more difficult portions of the letterpress.² The line reproduction is not pleasing—nor, for that matter, are some of the originals—and, what is worse, does not inspire confidence. In an undertaking of this importance one would have expected that resort would have been had to collotype, now that technical developments have considerably reduced the cost of the process. But if that was not practicable, the critical value of the work could yet have been greatly increased, and its appearance improved, by using throughout half-tone, which in fact here gives surprisingly good results.

Mr Fletcher's task fell into two distinct parts. The first was, by comparing as many copies of each printed text as possible, to establish in every detail and beyond dispute the exact typographical reading of every line, and incidentally to detect any real typographical differences between one copy and another.³ The second was to discover by collation and to record the differences of reading between one edition and another. These are two quite distinct tasks, and to combine the records in a single set of notes, as Mr Fletcher does, is to produce a degree of confusion that appreciably lessens the value of the work.

It is for the most part in connexion with collation that questions of method present themselves. Mr Fletcher's methods often strike me as unsatisfactory. He prints first the collection of 1673 and makes it the basis of his collation, giving for this the surprising reason that 'this edition is the last Milton himself *could* have seen through the press, and it *thus* becomes the most important' (p. 1: my italics). Waiving the point that since Milton had been totally blind for twenty years he could in no case have *seen* the edition through the press, I may remark that to assume that an author necessarily corrected the last edition of a work published in his lifetime is contrary to all experience; and if he did not correct it, the fact

¹ There is, I think, only one attempt at textual criticism, on p. 170, where the reading 'A here' (misprint for 'And here') is defended on the ground that *here* can mean 'army, host, company'. It cannot (the noun *here* ceased to be current in the fifteenth century), and if it could it would not make sense.

² I do not know why half-tone was used for the particularly clear 1637 *Comus*, but it is welcome. Only one page of the ode to Rouse is in half-tone, which is unfortunate, since the original is in bad condition, and parts of the line facsimile consequently illegible. Indeed, all through there are passages in the texts that

can barely be read, e.g. (in the copy before me) on pp. 172, 177, 368 (where for some reason the Vane sonnet has been reduced to half-size) and 437 (in the Trinity manuscript). On p. 316 a faint speaker's name in the Ellesmere manuscript appears to have been trimmed off in the facsimile. The reduction of the pages of the Trinity manuscript to a height of 8 in. makes the small writing sometimes difficult.

³ By a 'typographical reading' I mean the actual reading of the type, as distinguished from the apparent reading of the impression, which is sometimes misleading.

that he could have done so is irrelevant. It is, I presume, true that the 1673 edition represents Milton's final selection of his shorter poems,¹ and that he was responsible for a few alterations in the text (though Mr Fletcher adduces no evidence for it); but that it should therefore be made the basis of a critical edition (that is, be accepted as the copy-text) is one of the fallacies that have misled editors in the past. There can, I think, be no doubt at all that the text of 1645 and the separate prints of *Lycidas* and *Comus* are generally nearer to Milton's intention in spelling and punctuation than is the text of 1673.

Perhaps it was an uneasy suspicion that this might be the case that led Mr Fletcher to undertake the heavy and mainly useless labour of recording every deviation of spelling and punctuation between 1673 and the earlier texts. On the other hand, there is practically no collation at all of the manuscripts.² Thus in *Comus*, for example, we have, under the 1673 text, all the variants of 1645 and 1637, but none of either of the manuscripts.³ What is the result? Thanks to the reproduction of Wright's transcript of the Trinity manuscript we are able to trace how the text of the masque took shape under Milton's hand: thanks to Mr Fletcher's collations we are able to trace its fortunes from 1637 to 1645 and from 1645 to 1673. But the link between manuscript and print is missing: we are told nothing of what happened to the text in fair copy and composition—surely a matter of no less interest. The Ellesmere manuscript is of course less important: still, it seems to represent the acting version and contains at least one line not in the printed texts,⁴ and Mr Fletcher thinks it likely to be 'a copy prepared at the instigation of the poet Milton, himself, by one of his father's professional scribes' (p. 300). It is only incidentally that Mr Fletcher gives us a clue to his theory with regard to collation. Discussing the lines on Shakespeare, he writes (p. 365): 'No collation between the versions found in the Shakespeare publications and Milton's own printings is provided because so far as is known there is no connection between them.' This can only mean that he considers collation to be worth while only in a series of texts printed from one another. Of course, exactly the opposite is true. It may be questioned how far it is worth collating reprints: there is no doubt whatever that all substantive texts of any possible authority should be collated.⁵

One reason for this reluctance to multiply the number of texts collated is obvious enough: for any number over three the method of record here adopted would hardly be intelligible. Here are a few samples taken at random from *Comus* (p. 57): 'feveral] feverall]]'; 'government,] government,] government'; 'wear]] weare'; 'Scepter,]]] Columbia note is wrong.' No doubt there is much to be said for avoiding the repetition of sigla, if it can be done without ambiguity; but I do not think that in carrying it to this extreme Mr Fletcher has been kind to readers, especially as he has nowhere explained his procedure, but has left it to them to puzzle out.⁶ Moreover—and this is the real objection—though the notation is theoretically

¹ P. 7: 'The book contains all the minor poems which Milton wished to preserve, except the four sonnets xv–xvii and xxii of the Columbia numbering. But is not their exclusion evidence that Milton did *not* wish to preserve them?

² For Sonnet xxiii (Columbia), 'Methought I saw my late espoused Saint', of which 1673 offers the only printed text, a collation of the Trinity manuscript is given (p. 45), but none in the parallel case of Sonnet xxi (p. 44).

³ The notes (p. 56) do not even mention that the masque is found in the Trinity manuscript, though the fact is duly recorded in the case of *Lycidas* (p. 52).

⁴ After l. 994 (which in the manuscript comes

near the beginning). Mr Fletcher, however, is wrong in saying (p. 303) that it is 'Present only here': it is also found (deleted) in the Trinity manuscript.

⁵ It is absurd to try to brush aside the authority of the text of the poem printed in the second Shakespeare folio in 1632, as Mr Fletcher does on p. 367. There is no reason to doubt that Milton himself provided the copy; and Mr Fletcher himself suggests that the Shakespeare *Poems* of 1640 may contain an independent and authoritative text.

⁶ The collations quoted above signify: feveral 1673, feverall 1645, 1637; government, 1673, government, 1645, government 1637; wear, 1673, 1645, weare, 1637; Scepter, 1673, 1645, 1637.

capable of extension, in practice it would soon become unmanageable, and might even waste as much space as it saved.

In treating of *Lycidas* Mr Fletcher duly reports what are believed to be autograph corrections in copies of the 1638 print in the British Museum and the Cambridge University Library. For example, l. 10: 'in margin is written "well" to come between "he" and "knew"' (p. 347). But the fact that Milton thus created the hypermetrical line

Who would not sing for Lycidas? he well knew

loses most of its interest unless brought into relation with the other facts that the redundant word is already present in the Trinity manuscript but is again absent in 1645—which sets Milton's editors a very pretty puzzle, on which Mr Fletcher has no word to say. The last of these corrections is found after l. 176, where according to Mr Fletcher the two copies 'have in the margin "in the blest kingdoms / of Joy, and Love"... The word "meek" may have followed "kingdoms"... as the margins are badly worn away' (p. 352). This may be true of the Museum copy, it is not so of the Cambridge, which reads quite clearly 'in the blest kingdoms / meeke of Joy and Love'. Furthermore, in the Cambridge copy, l. 175, 'oazie' is corrected in the margin to 'dossie' (T.C.C. 'oozie', 1645 'oozy'), a fact which Mr Fletcher appears to have overlooked. He is also, it seems, unaware that there exists a copy of the 1637 *Comus*, apparently a presentation copy to the Earl of Bridgewater, containing nine corrections also probably in Milton's hand. It is in Mr Carl Pforzheimer's collection, and the corrections are recorded in the catalogue published in 1940 (pp. 1281-2), three years before Mr Fletcher's volume appeared. Nor does he mention Camillus Cardoyn's album, preserved in the Harvard College Library, into which Milton copied the last two lines of *Comus* at Geneva on 10 June 1639. It is of some interest as confirming the spelling 'Heaven' in the Trinity manuscript, where all the printed texts have 'Heav'n'.

Mr Fletcher would probably agree that the most important part of his work is that in which, by a comparison of copies, he seeks to establish in detail the readings of each textual authority; but once again I feel that some of his patient labour has been misdirected. It is not for me to depreciate the significance of such intensive investigation; but it is important that the investigator should constantly bear in mind the object of his study, and not be seduced into recording typographical irregularities for their own sake. The object, as I conceive it, is twofold. Type was sometimes corrected in the course of printing, and it is therefore necessary to determine which is the more authoritative state of the text. More often the impression made by the type was defective, so that it is only by consulting several copies that it is possible to ascertain what type was actually used. Typographical irregularities that do not result in any uncertainty of reading are irrelevant to the object in view, and for my part I see no gain in recording them.¹

Intentional variants between copies are rare in the early editions of Milton's poems. Alternative imprints in the 1673 volume, a trifling change in the title-page of 1645, a correction of indentation in the 1638 *Lycidas* and of a stage direction in the 1637 *Comus*—these are all illustrated in the facsimiles, and they almost exhaust the list. The imprints raise a problem to be faced later: of the rest the alteration in *Comus* is the most interesting. Here one Museum copy differs from all others known, in which, according to Mr Fletcher (p. 287), 'two lines have been entirely reset'. I very much doubt whether this is so. A misprint was corrected and bad spacing adjusted by a run-over; that was all. The impression in the Museum copy

¹ But I confess I do not follow Mr Fletcher's explanation (p. 1): 'A variant within the same edition may begin as a sort of peculiarity in a particular copy or in some particular copies,

and then the peculiarity may have been changed at some point of the printing process; hence any peculiarity in any copy may, but not necessarily must, give rise to a true variant in another copy.'

is very rough: there can be little doubt that a proof-sheet has been accidentally bound up—a view confirmed by a wrong fount on another page of the same forme in this copy (p. 283, l. 560).¹

Ambiguities of reading due to faulty impression are, on the other hand, frequent, and any information that helps to clear them up is welcome.² However, while it is always difficult to judge with confidence of typographical detail by means of facsimiles, especially if one feels uncertain of their fidelity, I am sometimes unable to reconcile Mr Fletcher's notes with the evidence of his reproductions. For instance, p. 13: 'Poems.] Ink mark above the period appears in all copies examined.' But no mark appears in the facsimile. On the other hand, catchwords in the facsimile are often almost illegible (p. 173 affords a glaring example), but, since nothing is said to the contrary, it is charitable to assume that they are clear in the original. May I suggest that if a facsimile is intended to replace the original for use by students, it is just as important to record imperfections of the facsimile as to record imperfections of the original? However, after making allowance for some lack of reliability in the reproductions, it is difficult to believe that Mr Fletcher's record is always complete and consistent. Thus, taking a page (289) on which the half-tone reproduction is satisfactorily clear, I find three faint letters noted (l. 712 *t*, 713 *n*, 736 *p*) and four other equally faint letters passed over in silence (l. 714 *d*, 715 *l*, 733 *t*, 740 *n*). And even were the record trustworthy, there would remain another criticism to make. In such work it is not enough that peculiarities should be observed; it is at least desirable that they should be correctly interpreted. This is where Mr Fletcher often fails. On the page just examined he notes (l. 736): 'The descender of the "p" in "upon" has lost out in conflict with the ascender of the "b" below, and has barely printed.' I cannot accept this explanation. Ascenders and descenders do not elsewhere 'conflict', and there is no reason why they should. The 'p' has not printed properly because the 'u' and the 'o' are standing up; just as in l. 732 the 'h' of 'fraught' is faint because the 'g' and the 't' are standing up. So again on p. 264 we are told that in l. 4 'The lower kern of the "f" in the word "*familie*" is broken off, probably to clear the capital letter immediately below it', and that in l. 7 'The "f" of "*Jelfe*" has been trimmed top and bottom to fit in between the "g" descending above it, and the "l" rising below it'. Mr Fletcher apparently thinks that these mutilations are deliberate! But the kerns of italic letters are sideways, not up and down, and there should have been no interference. They were brittle, however, and often broke off. On p. 14 we are told that in l. 7 'The "*H*" is dropped down in all copies examined'. Since the type is set solid and there is no sign of disturbance, this is impossible: the '*H*' is a 'turned' letter. P. 263, l. 14: 'The "*s*" in "ROBINSON", is italic': it has indeed a slight slope (perhaps due to a faulty matrix) but is quite different from the true italic letter of the fount. There is a similar letter in l. 4 of the Shakespeare epitaph on p. 367, which Mr Fletcher has overlooked.³

There are other indications that Mr Fletcher's acquaintance with seventeenth-century printing has its limitations. We are told on p. 8 that a 'peculiarity of this type font [1673] appears in the star shaped period'. It does not, of course, belong to the fount, being a black-letter point that has fouled the compositor's case. In

¹ It is, of course, an editor's duty to be on the lookout for such press corrections: he need not go out of his way to invent them. Of a reading on p. 176 we are told that 'it may well be that a few copies exist in which the correction was made in the type'. Since all copies in which it looked as though the correction had been made in the type proved on examination to have been altered in manuscript, the suggestion is uncalled for.

² Work on typographical minutiae of course often needs the help of a magnifying glass.

Mr Fletcher describes the microscopic and photographic methods of magnification he has used (p. 2). He even reproduces (p. 159) an enlargement of a single letter to demonstrate the nature of the stop after it. This we are told was photographed 'at about one hundred diameters'. Actually the magnification is just over ten diameters. Mr Fletcher has apparently confused linear with superficial magnification.

³ This crooked 's' is normal in some founts: I have been taken in by it myself before now.

the epistle dedicatory to the 1637 *Comus* (p. 264) we are rather solemnly told that 'The "w" in [*Bridgewater*] should be noted carefully', and twice more we are bidden to 'Note' the same. Why? It is the normal letter of the fount, and occurs not three times, as implied, but fourteen!

The Greek poems in 1645 and 1673 present difficulties, for many accents and breathings are indecipherable, and Mr Fletcher pardonably excuses himself from attempting a collation: but he should not have said (p. 134) of l. 4 of *Philosophus ad regem* that 'The entire line is different' in the two editions, when half the words are the same. On p. 98 is the strange statement that the Greek founts of the two editions differ, '1673 using a standard θ medially, and 1645 using a character for θ that looks like ϑ '. It is ϑ , and $\vartheta = \theta$! But the statement is incorrect. It is 1645 that uses θ throughout; 1673 uses θ and ϑ indifferently (position has nothing to do with it). On p. 9 we are told that 'The accent marks in the Latin poems [in 1673] have been set from a font that had too few of them'. I hesitate to believe that Mr Fletcher really thinks that the accents were set separately from the letters, though expressions on pp. 106 and 136 also seem to imply it. On the other hand the suggestion (pp. 106, 108, 136) that the printer provided himself with a diaeresis by filing off the top of a circumflex accent is interesting and very likely correct, though rather spoiled by the mention elsewhere (p. 130) of 'a diaeresis with the head cut off'. Another interesting suggestion is on p. 32: 'The alignment here [near the foot of p. 35 of 1673] makes it obvious that the compositor emptied his stick upon completing this line [18]'. In fact I detect no unusual misalignment at this point, and I might have felt uncertain of the meaning had not the matter been pursued elsewhere (p. 151). Such failures are certainly observable in 1645; but I am a little doubtful of their significance. I wonder, namely, whether any unevenness arising in the course of transferring type from the stick to the galley would survive transference from the galley to the forme and locking in the chase. I am more inclined to believe that, the type being rather heavily 'lead'ed, the compositor used, not metal leads, but wooden reglets, and that these were not always cut quite true.

As with typography, so with bibliography and palaeography: there are everywhere signs of imperfect understanding. It is unlikely that the English and Latin sections of the 1645 collection were meant to be issued separately, since the first title-page mentions both. Mr Fletcher thinks otherwise (p. 150), but all his arguments go to show is that they are bibliographically distinct. What he means when he says (p. 149) that 'They may or may not have been separately printed', I do not know: every sheet of a book is 'separately printed', and the two parts were certainly produced by the same printer at the same time.¹ Elsewhere he writes (p. 215): 'The omission [of the signature on H4] is another bit of evidence that the English and Latin poems... were bound and sold separately, as the Latin poems begin on sheets that are not conjugate with the English sheets.' H4 is unsigned because it is the last leaf of a (half-sheet) quire, and it is evidence of nothing else: sheets cannot be conjugate, he presumably means leaves. The 1645 volume was printed by Ruth Raworth, the widow of John Raworth:² Mr Fletcher tries to trace a connexion between Raworth and Milton (p. 149), which is fanciful, since it was doubtless Moseley who chose his printer—just as the printer of the 1637 *Comus*, whoever he may have been,³ worked for Humphrey Robinson and

¹ Nor do I know what he means by the signatures of an octavo being 'in double fours' (p. 149), or by saying that 'The chain lines are vertical on the page, and orientation of the original sheet is therefore fairly easy' (p. 150).

² Who, we are told, was 'made free of the Stationers Company according to Plomer, about 1632'. Plomer gives the exact date, 6 Feb. 1632.

³ John Raworth according to Mr Fletcher (p. 262): but the Pforzheimer catalogue, which has behind it the authority of Dr W. A. Jackson, assigns it to Augustine Mathewes. Mr Fletcher (p. 7) identifies the printer 'W.R.' of the 1673 collection as William Rawlins, no doubt correctly.

not for Henry Lawes, as Mr Fletcher would have it. As to the date: 'It was entered in the *Stationers Register* 6 October 1645; the title page bears the date "1645"; the Thomason copy... has the manuscript date "Jan. 2" [actually 'Jan. 2^d']... Those are the facts; but the book might have appeared any time between August, 1645, and January 2, 1645 O.S. or 1646 as we would write it today.'¹ Presumably August is chosen because John Raworth's will was proved on the 5th of that month: but probate takes time and Ruth was probably at work before the end of July. It is of course unlikely, though not I admit impossible, that the volume was published before its entrance in the *Register*.

But it is over the portrait in the 1645 collection that Mr Fletcher has gone most astray. 'There are four leaves bound before the text of the English poems. The first of these leaves... has its apparent recto blank, with the... portrait... on the apparent verso [p. 149]... [p. 150]. As the fragment of watermark [in certain copies of the portrait] is on the outer, not the inner margin of the leaf, it is obvious that the portrait leaf was originally printed recto with the title page,² then cut, and the print made to appear as a verso printing in order that it might face the title page.' This assumes that the portrait was printed at the same time as the letterpress, which is impossible. An engraving requires a special press, and the half-sheet would have to be passed through this separately, supposing that it was large enough to take it. But Mr Fletcher is mistaken: the portrait forms no part of the half-sheet. The first leaf of this, a1, is blank, and survives in several copies; the portrait was printed on a separate leaf, inserted between a1 and a2 (title), the counterfoil of which is still visible after a3 in one Bodleian copy. This was, of course, the usual procedure, and shows that the remark on p. 9 about there being 'no proper place' for a portrait in the 1673 volume is meaningless. About the portrait itself Mr Fletcher seems a little uncertain. He speaks on p. 149 of 'the crudely cut, but well drawn portrait by William Marshall', which leaves it in doubt whether he thought Marshall was the engraver or the artist; and on p. 153 says: 'This portrait... "W. M. sculp." if the signature at the bottom of the verse applies as it probably does also to the portrait... was well drawn; but the cut... is very bad.' It required some ingenuity to imagine that the signature might apply only to the verses; and since the original is not extant one can hardly tell whether the defects of the portrait, which certainly did not please Milton, were due to the artist or to the engraver. In fact the engraving, though no masterpiece, is not technically incompetent; but since Mr Fletcher has reproduced it by offset in line, the result is naturally unpleasing. I can see nothing 'puzzling' in the inscription 'Anno Aetatis Vigess: Pri:' in itself: obviously the original was done in 1629—but it might have been mentioned that 'Pri:' seems to have been altered on the plate.³

The 1673 volume presents students with the curious problem of the variant imprint—or what Mr Fletcher calls 'the publisher's signature' (p. 10). It is of course common to find alternative imprints with the names of different publishers or booksellers, but I do not at the moment recall any other instance of imprints varying only in the publisher's address. Yet here some copies locate Thomas Dring at the White Lion, others at the Blue Anchor. Mr Fletcher writes: 'It has always been assumed⁴ that Dring was first at the Blew Anchor and then at the

¹ Mr Fletcher makes the usual mistake about old and new style: e.g. p. 43, 'dated "Feb. 9, 1645" i.e., 1646, N.S.' (and cf. p. 364). In the seventeenth century 9 Feb. O.S. = 19 Feb. N.S.: the beginning of the year is another matter.

² Meaning, I suppose, 'on the recto, like the title-page'; but the expression is unfamiliar to me.

³ Mr Fletcher might also have warned readers that there is at least one eighteenth-century (?) copy of the plate, which has sometimes been used to make up copies that had lost the original portrait.

⁴ This is not the case. According to Plomer he moved from the White Lion to the Blue Anchor in 1673 and thence to the Harrow in 1674. The first statement may be an inference from the present book. I suspect that the Harrow was only a later name for the White Lion: both were in Fleet Street at the corner of Chancery Lane. The Blue Anchor was a little further east opposite Fetter Lane. May not Dring have occupied the Blue Anchor while he was re-building, and incidentally renaming, his other shop?

White Lion, so far as the issuing of these two title pages goes,¹ largely because in the *Term Catalogue* entry, he was located at the Blew Anchor.' This may not, as Mr Fletcher remarks, be a very good reason; more cogent is the fact (which he has overlooked) that the catalogue of books at the end of the volume (sigs. S7-8) also gives the address of the Blue Anchor, and this must have been printed before the preliminaries, which include errata. However, Dring is known to have been at the White Lion in 1672: his sign was the Harrow in 1675. Mr Fletcher continues: 'Of course all these locations were near each other, and he may have begun using any one of them before he had given up either of the others. Indeed, he might have used two of them simultaneously.' If Dring began using one shop before vacating another, he must indeed have used two simultaneously! And this is doubtless what he did. For it is absurd to suppose that he moved from one shop to another during the few hours the sheet was in the press! The only alternative is to suppose the White Lion imprint to be an error of the printer's, and in that case it would almost certainly have been cancelled.

Mr Fletcher devotes a good deal of attention to the end-papers of copies still in their original bindings, on the baseless assumption that they were 'prepared for the binder by the printer' (p. 8). The cutting away of most of the outer leaf of the fly before pasting down was the usual practice, and has nothing to do with 'tipping on heavier paster sheets'. He thinks that the paper for the 1673 volume was 'probably made in England, perhaps across the Channel' (p. 10). One or other, no doubt; I wonder why his preference for England? Why should he suspect (p. 150) that in the 1645 collection 'Perhaps an occasional sheet of double cap paper was used', when admittedly there is not a shred of evidence for it? But clearly he is throughout thinking in terms of doubles, as a modern printer would be apt to do, for he repeatedly speaks of 'quarter sheets' when he means half-sheets (e.g. on pp. 262 and 300). Of the copy of the 1637 *Comus* reproduced he remarks (p. 262) that the preliminary half-sheet has a watermark and the final half-sheet has none, 'which fact makes it unlikely' that they ever formed part of one sheet. On the contrary, the book being a quarto, it is just this fact that makes it possible, and there can be little doubt that the two half-sheets were printed together, though they may of course have been separated before gathering.

Lastly palaeography. A combination of meticulous care and inexperience is apparent in the transcripts of the Ellesmere *Comus* and the ode to John Rouse. In the former Mr Fletcher has carefully reproduced a queer mark, like *u*, that occurs persistently, but that he admits not understanding (p. 303). It is simply part of the preceding *f* (or occasionally *f*), as he would have seen had he studied the more formal script of the title-page: it often indicates a capital, but is very loosely used. Secretary and Italian script are not distinguished: in l. 78 the Italian '*Comus*' is noted as being in 'larger letters', but not, for instance, in l. 112, s.d. The treatment of contractions is inconsistent: *wth* and *w^{ch}* are retained, *p* and *m* are usually expanded; but in the case of 'rep'sentacōn' on p. 301 the contraction marks are retained and the expansions printed as well! Many of the alternative readings suggested are unhappy: particularly at l. 68 'manners', 'could be "mariners"'—it *should* be 'mariners', it *could* be nothing of the sort. Worst of all Mr Fletcher has had the unlucky idea of scoring through in his transcript (before it was reproduced by offset) all words deleted in the original, so that they are if anything more illegible than in the facsimile: perhaps it was a measure of precaution. On p. 98 Mr Fletcher writes as follows:

There is one notable fact about the text of [Milton's] Latin poetry that needs emphasizing. This is the fact that we possess no manuscripts of any of it that are certainly authentic copies made either by Milton or under his direction. There is one possible, but not probable exception, viz., the manuscript now in the Bodleian Library at Oxford

¹ The meaning of this qualification escapes me.

that contains *Ad Joannem Rousium*. This, however, is probably but not necessarily in some other hand than Milton's. That is, the handwriting is unlike any writing known to be Milton's own. It is possible, the copy being in a large, set hand, that the writing represents the kind of handwriting Milton employed for formal, fair, and final copy. But we cannot be certain that this document is actually in Milton's handwriting. That is, we have no holograph copies of any of the Latin poems.

It is obvious that there is nothing here to justify the categorical statement of the last sentence. This is, in fact, probably true: on the other hand, there is no reason to doubt that the Bodleian manuscript, if not autograph, is at any rate a careful and authentic copy sent by Milton himself to his friend the librarian. Mr Fletcher produces neither evidence nor argument for or against its being in Milton's hand. It is, therefore, all the more unfortunate that in transcribing the verses he should have omitted to notice the curious diaeresis on 'Rôûsium' (heading), 'Rôûsius' (l. 47), and 'Rôûsi' (l. 78), since this provides the one serious argument in favour of autography ('Rôûsio' occurs in an autograph inscription in a volume of Milton's tracts at Bodley); or to observe that the marginal correction 'Graiaë' in l. 71 is apparently in a different hand from the rest and is probably Milton's own, since this is practically conclusive against the body of the text being holograph. Mr Fletcher calls the manuscript 'a longhand copy' (p. 458)—well, it is certainly not shorthand! In reproducing Wright's transcript of the Trinity manuscript, he pays a deserved tribute to its accuracy: 'His errors of omission or commission were very few, but occasionally inexplicable, as in the case of the name "Thomason"' (p. 383); yet he elsewhere admits that the 'a' that Wright overlooked in this deleted name 'is barely visible' (p. 446)—indeed, if one were to judge only from Mr Fletcher's reproduction, one would say that it was by no means certain. It seems to have been first detected by J. S. Smart in 1921 (p. 43).

To future editors of Milton Mr Fletcher's volume will undoubtedly prove a considerable convenience, but they will hardly find it of as much assistance as they had a right to expect. Three more volumes are promised.

W. W. GREG

PETWORTH

Coleridge's *'Hymn before Sunrise'*. *A Study of Facts and Problems connected with the Poem*. By ADRIEN BONJOUR. Lausanne. Imprimerie La Concorde. 1942. 236 pp.

The special interest of Coleridge's last major poem, the *Hymn Before Sunrise*, lies in its composition four months after *Dejection*, its close and unacknowledged connexion with Friederike Brun's *Chamounix beym Sonnenaufgange*, and Coleridge's claim to have poured it forth, without premeditation, on the top of Scawfell. This claim Dr Bonjour dismisses on the evidence of the rediscovered 'great-sheet letter', written to Sara Hutchinson and recording in close detail all the incidents of Coleridge's 'circumcursion' on the fells. Nor can he, in the light of Coleridge's transcription of Friederike Brun's notes, accept Mr Fausset's theory that the plagiarism was unconscious. He looks for its cause in the state of the poet's mind in 1802. The full expression in *Dejection* of his anguish at the loss of his poetic power had probably lightened his melancholy; improved health, after months of illness, and better relations with his wife had combined to promote a renewal of hope. He saw mountains every day and found himself still able to climb them. Friederike Brun's poem provided him with a stimulus and a framework, and may also, as Dr Bonjour illuminatingly suggests, have stirred up in his memory the enthusiasm connected with his earlier schemes of translating into blank verse the chapter *De Montibus* in Burnet's *Theoria Sacra*. Under these various stimuli the poem was written, and as it concerned Coleridge deeply to convince his friends, and through them himself, that his poetic powers were still at work, he departed

from his usual candour of acknowledgment, suppressed his indebtedness to the German poem and stressed whatever pointed to the spontaneity of the composition.

The inquiry is subtle and well-documented and adds something of significance to our knowledge of the dying throes of the poet in Coleridge. It is supported by an analysis of the variant readings in the four extant MSS. (including a hitherto unrecorded one at Harvard) and in the eight versions printed in Coleridge's lifetime. Dr Bonjour also prints parallel versions of the two most important states of the poem.

J. M. S. TOMPKINS

ENGLEFIELD GREEN

A Newman Treasury. Edited by CHARLES FREDERICK HARROLD. London: Longmans, Green. 1943. x+404 pp. 21s.

There can hardly fail to be a welcome for a new anthology of the writings of Cardinal Newman. Yet it is reasonable to seek justification for such a work, when we already possess some fifteen books of selections between 1870 and 1930. Professor Harrold disclaims any pursuit of a synthesis in selection. But he makes what seems perhaps a much greater claim:

My aim has been to present most of what Newman himself would have wished or permitted to be published in one volume at the end of his career. (p. viii.)

Elsewhere in his preface, his claim is

to reveal, as clearly as possible, the real Newman, who, if not Roman, was certainly Catholic always, and Roman Catholic in his greatest works. (p. ix.)

This would indicate a synthesis and purpose in selection, and may seem inconsistent. There is also a limitation to prose, with the exclusion of Newman's poetry, for no clear reason. Certainly both *Lyra Apostolica* and *The Dream of Gerontius* are essential to the understanding of Newman in any sense that one may choose, and to the reader for whom the book is designed,

for readers of whatever faith who find interest in Newman as a writer and as spiritual leader. (p. viii.)

On the whole, it would seem best to think of this as a personal selection, which is as good a basis as any for an anthology. For the rest, it is specifically entitled a 'Treasury', with an agreeably Victorian connotation.

In such a book, great care should be evident in the textual work of the editor and printer. There is no indication in the editorial matter upon the question of text. And the scholar may well be in some doubt. There is a 'Select Bibliography' at the end of the book, from which one might expect to find clues to the texts from which the selections are taken. The edition cited in the Bibliography, '*Sermons on Subjects of the Day*. London. 1843', is plainly not the edition used for the text of Sermon 2, pp. 151 ff., which is taken from the revised edition of 1873, *Sermons Bearing on Subjects of the Day*, as edited by W. J. Copeland. So also the quotation on p. 296 from *Parochial and Plain Sermons* is not from the original edition of 1834, but from the edition of 1868. The revisions, certainly, were the work of Newman himself. We do, however, desire to know whether we are dealing with an original or a revised text, with the text cited in the Bibliography or some other. This is not a matter of mere pedantry, when we are considering the revision by the Roman Catholic Newman, in 1868 or 1873, of the writings of the Anglican Newman of 1834 or 1843.

The proof-reading of the text, moreover, leaves something to be desired. For 'subtlety' read 'subtlety' (p. 7), for 'wicknedness' 'wickedness' (p. 152), for 'John ii. 15' 'I John ii. 15' (p. 153), for 'upon a large scale' 'upon on a large scale' (p. 155), for 'Egbaston' 'Edgbaston' (p. 394), for example. Professor Harold uses a phrase, in his useful 'Chronology' (p. 393), that would have puzzled Newman by its ob-

security, 'the Oxford Movement, as a reaction to Erastianism', which we might compare with Newman's own correct usage, 'Monachism... a reaction from that secular life' (p. 258).

In writing the book, it would have been of great advantage to have the various selections dated for reference, a matter of some importance with Newman (especially as the editor stresses the development of his style after 1843), if not in every instance at least on the list on p. 222.

The selection made by Professor Harrold will meet with general approval, within the limits of the scope of the book. I should for myself have liked more examples of that kind of writing which I should add to Professor Harrold's categories of Newman's style in his valuable Introduction (on pp. 24-5), of that 'pastoral style' which we find at its best on p. 192.

C. J. Sisson

LONDON

The Clue to Pascal. By EMILE CAILLIET. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press. 1943. 187 pp. \$2.00.

Nothing is more difficult (*experto crede*) than to find the right title for a book on Pascal. He himself was not responsible for the designation of either his anti-Jesuit pamphlets or his personal reflections. It was his printer who dubbed the former *Lettres Provinciales*, and his friends who christened the latter *Pensées*. So we need not be too nice, nor quarrel with M. Cailliet over the name under which he has launched this interesting volume, beyond registering an opinion that what he here offers to the reader is *one* of many clues to a complex problem.

If I understand him (for the very richness of his material rather obscures his argument), his 'clue' is the strictly scriptural character of Pascal's discharge of a self-imposed task. 'Blaise Pascal, Christian layman [a point most properly stressed: cf. pp. 11, 108] preaches Christ in the whole Bible'. This is very true, and we await with eager anticipation the development promised us (p. 82) of the theme of the part played by Scripture in the *Provinciales*. 'Pascal and the Bible' is indeed the subject of an elaborate study by M. J. Lhermet (Vrin, 1931) with which M. Cailliet is familiar and which he estimates at its proper value. But there is room for further and less prejudiced treatment. The subject is of primary importance in the story of Pascal who carried out with characteristic ardour and thoroughness what is a dominant feature of Port Royal teaching. As Dean Church once wrote: 'It was one of the earliest tendencies and efforts of the friends of Port Royal to popularize the Bible, and to make it in their own church the household book of devotion... which the Protestants had succeeded in making it.' M. Cailliet will certainly not challenge this judgement.

As for the task itself, viz. the vindication of Christianity, and the date of its inception, the writer sounds an uncertain note. On p. 118 Pascal is given 'scarcely a year' to work thereon. On p. 121 the term is extended to five years. Now I am prepared to extend it yet further. True, Mme Périer states that the inspiring motive was the 'Miracle of the Holy Thorn' (March 1656); but I cannot but believe that Pascal, the convert, began to think of stirring the torpid conscience of his *libertin* friends as soon as he forsook them for religion, i.e. after the fateful experience of November 24, 1654. In other words, the 'Miracle' encouraged and stimulated a movement already well under way. This may seem trivial, but Pascal's life was so short and so full that every date is of significance.

In a book of this compass (only 166 pages of text) there are necessarily some summary statements deserving expansion. For instance, the definition of Jansenism (p. 48); the equation free thinkers = 'Modernists' (p. 35); the apparent claim that Pascal invented the method of allegorical interpretation (p. 86), etc. I would not *m'inscrire en faux* against such (although I do deny that the *Augustinus* is a *quarto*!)

but I desire elucidation which would increase the value of a book which is as good an introduction to Pascal as any I know—erudite, well-balanced, up-to-date.

It is a good book, but I confess to a conviction that it would be still better, if it were written in French. What to the Frenchman is natural eloquence strikes the prosaic Anglo-Saxon as rhetorical. And Gallicisms abound—the *Morales* of St Basil, Arnobe, 'raise' for 'educate', 'intercession' for 'intervention', 'interview' translating 'entretien' and so on. These are small blemishes which can be removed in a reprint. But the whole 'feel' of the work is so French that the only remedy is a translation back into the tongue where M. Cailliet is most at home.

Since the above notice was written, an English edition of *The Clue* has been published by the S.C.M. Press. (London. 6s.).

H. F. STEWART

CAMBRIDGE

The Philosophy of Marsilio Ficino. By P. O. KRISTELLER. Translated into English by Virginia Conant. New York: Columbia University Press; London: H. Milford. 1943. xiv+441 pp. 30s.

Originally written in German and completed in 1937, ready for the press in an Italian translation in 1938, this work was to remain unpublished until 1943, when it eventually saw the light in an English version. To quote the author, its aim is 'to reconstruct the essential elements of Ficino's philosophy'. For such a task few scholars could have been better equipped than Dr Kristeller, whose *Supplementum Ficinianum* and various papers on Ficino have easily established him as a leading authority on the Florentine humanist. The thought of Marsilio Ficino had already been the subject of several books. But this work goes far beyond the studies by Saitta, Giuliano, Horbert, Anichini, and Dress, and presents for the first time a complete and thorough exposition of Ficino's philosophical system.

The philosophy of Marsilio Ficino was typical of the spirit of the Florentine Renaissance. It was so not only because it expressed the peculiarly Florentine genius for perfecting what others had started, but also because of its eclecticism, an eclecticism which in a different sphere though with a similar spirit could be found in Poliziano's *Orfeo* and *Stanze per la Giostra*. It was Leibniz who styled Ficino 'Bessarionis in effectu erga Platonis haeres', and there is no doubt that Ficino felt himself to be a link in the Platonic tradition, the heir of Bessarion and the long series of scholars who since the days of the 'Academy' had interpreted Plato's thought. Eclecticism, as we said, conditioned Ficino's approach to Plato. His system owed undoubtedly very much to Alexandrian, early Christian, and medieval writings. Yet all these elements were so well blended that no discordant note was struck, the result being a coherent system in which the doctrine of Plato was harmonized with the tenets of Christianity. Needless to say, Ficino's chief model had been St Augustine. Nevertheless, because of his conformity with medieval habits of thought, his bringing of Plato to the forefront of Christian philosophical speculation formed in a way the humanist answer to what the schoolmen of the thirteenth century and particularly St Thomas Aquinas had done for Aristotle. Hence the picture formerly attributed to Francesco Traini painted about 1365, in which Plato and Aristotle are placed one on either side of Aquinas, symbolizes quite vividly the position of the two Greek philosophers in the theology of the Renaissance.¹

How much Ficino's speculations were based upon the wedding of Plato and Christianity, and how, despite his eclectic approach to philosophical problems, he succeeded in evolving a system not devoid of original elements, which exerted a

¹ The subject of the picture, which is preserved in St Catherine's Church, Pisa, is the triumph of St Thomas Aquinas. A reproduction of it is in

R. Klibansky, *The Continuity of the Platonic Tradition* (London, 1939), plate 3.

powerful influence upon the Renaissance mind, is shown in the book under review. Quite rightly Dr Kristeller has classified Ficino's thought under main headings, and in spite of its difficulty he has succeeded in giving us a coherent and systematic exposition of his philosophy. Thanks to the clearness with which the various aspects of the Ficinian doctrines are dealt with, even those who do not profess philosophy will find the contents of this study well within their reach, enabling them to acquaint themselves with an important aspect of Renaissance thought. A few details are open to question. To include Tasso's prose works amongst the 'Trattati d'Amore' is rather inaccurate. It is true that some of the *dialoghi* fall within such a category. But it would be wellnigh impossible to describe thus all Tasso's prose writings which, as is well known to any student of Italian literature, include discussions on literary criticism, ethics, etc. Again, one feels forced to challenge the view that 'it is perhaps not too much to say that all of educated Florence in the second half of the fifteenth century came under the intellectual influence of Ficino's Academy'. Many of Ficino's Florentine contemporaries were doubtless deeply influenced by his philosophy. But there were also scholars closely connected with the Medici who were quite unaffected by Ficino's teaching. This is particularly brought home by two treatises on ideas, one by Niccolò da Foligno and one anonymous but probably also by Niccolò, both of which were studied by Dr Lynn Thorndyke in his *Science and Thought in the Fifteenth Century*. Now what is striking in these treatises, both of which are addressed to Lorenzo de Medici, is that, with the exception of Porphyry and Macrobius, no Platonists are mentioned, and that no notice is taken of Ficino's writings. Perhaps Dr Thorndyke limited Ficino's influence too much on the strength of this evidence. All the same these two treatises show quite clearly how even in the Medicean circle there were scholars who were not influenced by Ficino's Platonism. Incidentally the above-mentioned book by Dr Thorndyke does not appear in the bibliography to which may now be added also R. Klibansky, 'Plato's *Parmenides* in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance', *Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, I (1943), pp. 281-330.¹

In spite of such strictures and a few other trifles not worth mentioning, there is no doubt that Dr Kristeller has a claim to the gratitude of all Renaissance scholars for providing them with such a valuable account of the philosophy of the scholar about whom Poliziano aptly wrote:

Mores ingenium, musas, sophiamque supremam,
vis uno dicam nomine? Marsilius.

In fact a book like this makes one look forward eagerly to Dr Kristeller's edition of Francesco da Diacceto's unpublished works and study on *the teaching of philosophy in Italian universities during the Renaissance*, and makes one also express the hope that he may present us at some future date with a biography of Ficino which will supersede at last the account by Della Torre, which so far remains, in spite of its shortcomings, the leading authority on the subject.

R. WEISS

LONDON

Pennsylvania German Literature. By EARL F. ROBACKER. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1943. viii + 217 pp. 15s. 6d.

This well-organized survey of trends from 1683 to 1942 ably demonstrates the function of serious academic research in the interests of the community. A full bibliography gives evidence of extensive quest among printed and manuscript

¹ One may also add G. Saitta, *Marsilio Ficino e la filosofia dell'umanesimo* (Firenze, 1942); P. Rotta, *Niccolò Cusano* (Milano, 1942); G. Pico della Mirandola, *De hominis dignitate*, ed. B.

Cicognani (Firenze, 1941); G. Pico della Mirandola, *De hominis dignitate, Heptaplus, De ente et uno e scritti vari*, ed. E. Garin (Firenze, 1942).

material, comprising mainly plays and fiction, part of which, appearing in short-lived magazines, was by no means easy to procure. Praise for the author's labours must be tinged with sympathy when he states the unusual and regrettable fact that certain works are inaccessible in private collections. Some English readers will be mystified by apparent neglect of H. L. Mencken's chapter on German in his *American Language*, which has been for good or ill the *vade mecum* of most here interested in trans-Atlantic usage; Dr Robacker has doubtless good reasons to account for the omission. Some will welcome the author's care to correct false impressions, for example his definite exclusion of Kurt Stein's amusing jargon-books of Chicago origin. Others will unite in the hope that this work may deservedly provide a model for further research into the language and literature of smaller groups of German-speaking sectarians, notably the Mennonites of Canada. For this, and perhaps for further detailed study of Pennsylvania 'Dutch', a more intensive examination of individual literary sources, of mystic or pietist German origin, would be desirable. The author purposely excludes much dogmatic and hymnal literature, but those who have heard or read the curious antiquated phrases used every day by even young Mennonites will agree that the matter deserves earnest consideration.

Warde, Warde, so viel Sarde!
Deel vun do un deel vun darde;
Deel, die sin so wiescht verdreht
As sie niemand meh verschteht.

Understanding of this fascinating patchwork of High German, dialect, and jargon is one specific proposal of the author for future research. But understanding entails an intensive study of the sorts and sources of words and speech-patterns, which might well achieve something beyond the characterization of local literature. Here and there the author makes apposite comment on things outside the 'Dutchland': for example the mid- and late-nineteenth century American provincial literature, and once (p. 117) the 'European transcendental influence.' Without any hint of political association, I should venture to say that Dr Robacker appears in this piece of literary research as an 'isolationist'. But after all, he sets out to perform an eleventh-hour task, making a purely regional study before standardization 'will have reduced racial minorities to a common level.' From the point of view of European scholarship at least it would be added merit if his success in this warmly sympathetic effort should induce further research into Old World origins on a clear basis of language and style.

W. F. MAINLAND

LONDON

SHORT NOTICES

In his *Two Lectures on an Aesthetic of Literature* (Bombay: Karnatak Publishing House. 1944. 52 pp. Rs. 1 As. 4), Mr B. S. Mardhekar continues the main theme of his earlier *Arts and the Man*. In the present work he explains the method by which he arrives at his conception of the rhythmical pattern of emotional relations as the essential quality of great literature. This pattern he regards as 'more compelling, more organic than the sequential necessity which the Aristotelians demand in a work of literature'. The first lecture, on *Form in Literature*, discovers form, not in the mode of presentation, nor in the relation of the mode to the experiences presented, but in the balance and harmony of emotion, which forms the subject of the second lecture. Here Mr Mardhekar shows how this can be ascertained by weighing the meaning and associations of the words which have more than a purely existential function. The brevity of the lecture form allows illustration from lyrics only and Mr Mardhekar neatly contrasts the use made by Goldsmith and T. S. Eliot of 'When lovely woman stoops to folly'. There is a hint of the applica-

tion of these criteria to *King Lear* and it is to be hoped that in further work Mr Mardhekar will show whether it is possible to apply them to works of similar scale and complexity.

ELIZABETH J. SWEETING

LONDON

In editing for the first time *The Middle English Verse Life of Edward the Confessor* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania. 1942. xciii+142 pp. 12s. 6d.), Miss Grace Edna Moore has made available for us an important Middle English work hitherto inaccessible and has also collected much illustrative material of special importance and significance for the study of medieval legends. She has wisely taken MS. Cotton Julius D IX as the basis of her text, the only one undamaged or uncondensed, but the collations with Bodley 779 and Ashmole 43 are a model of scholarly accuracy, though in the case of the former its divergencies from the fuller MS. are so numerous that it is not easy to gain a complete picture of this later condensed version which, however, is of very secondary value. The editing is excellent, but the critical apparatus is needlessly scanty in a dissertation of this size except for the accurate dialectal statistics, which are not always on the other hand properly interpreted. On page xci she incorrectly lists among Southern features imperative plurals in *-eþ* and past participles with the *i-* (*y-*) prefix; these are certainly not Southern in any exclusive sense, and to speak of *a+l+cons. as a* as a Western feature when unmutated is careless. But the actual forms are right and the general location of the text correct. The strength of the volume lies in the comparative material assembled. We are given the text of the prose life of Edward the Confessor from MS. Brit. Mus. Add. 35298, which is specially interesting for its close relationship with Caxton's version in his *Golden Legend*, and a useful survey of the Latin and French lives on the subject. But in her treatment of the historical and legendary material Miss Moore would have been wiser to refrain from her rather excessive dogmatism regarding the processes of popular canonization. The process of disentangling the legendary material from the ascertained historical foundations is not quite so easy, but for the accurate assembling of facts, many of them hitherto unavailable, our thanks are due. The whole book is an important supplement to Horstmann's *Altenglische Legenden*.

J. P. OAKDEN

ST ANDREWS

Mr G. Wilson Knight advises readers of his book *The Olive and the Sword* (London: Oxford University Press. 1944. viii+102 pp. 6s.):

If something must be skipped, skip my comments, which serve mainly to introduce and give contemporary impact to a series of great passages.

The invitation might almost disarm the critic, the more so in that it directs attention to Mr Knight's felicity in the selection of lines and passages. But the critic, if not quite disarmed, might persistently object that there is one place for war anthologies, and a different place for literary criticism (and probably no place at all for *sortes Shakespearianae*). A propos the difference between the two kinds of literary enterprise, one might cite a passage from one of Rilke's letters:

überhebelich wäre es, einem Kunstwerk zuzumuten, dass es helfen könne; aber dass die Spannung des Menschlichen, die ein Kunstwerk, ohne sie nach aussen zu verwenden, in sich trägt, dass seine innere Intensität, ohne extensiv zu werden, durch ihre blosse Gegenwart, die Täuschung hervorrufen konnte, als ob sie Streben, Forderung, Werbung ... sei: das ist des Kunst-Dings gutes Gewissen (nicht sein Beruf)....

The thesis that Shakespeare's plays were written in prophetic vein is open to objections. One recalls a conversation in Peacock's *Gryll Grange*:

Mrs. Opimian. There used to be seven deadly sins. How many has modern progress added to them?

The Rev. Dr. Opimian. None, I hope, my dear. But this will be due, not to its own tendencies, but to the comprehensiveness of the old definitions.

It is not by virtue of prophecy, but by virtue of the comprehensiveness of the old definitions, that Shakespeare's portraits may have present-day applications. Nor was there any originality in his thought of order as the mainstay of the common weal; a glance at the first chapter of Elyot's *Governour*—to take but one example—will show how little Shakespeare varied from the common theme.

Finally, the critic might object to the zig-zag of Mr Knight's final chapter, where our currency and our Shakespeare and our national history rush towards one another by the propulsion of associative imagery, but here too the critic is forestalled by the writer's own admissions and retires, rather baffled, from the transcendental fray.

W. M. T. DODDS

LONDON

The 1939 volume of the very interesting and valuable *Handbook of Latin American Studies* was reviewed here last year. The volume for 1941, edited by Miron Burgin (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1942. xv+649 pp. 22s. 6d.), is much larger and wider in scope: nearly 6000 numbered items, two new categories—Bibliography, and Labour and Social Welfare—longer summaries or commentaries on each item; the work is correspondingly more useful to the specialist. The summaries are unequal: a Brazilian translation of a book by Maritain (No. 5070) occupies two-thirds of a column (and falls short of perfect objectivity), while some of the notes on books in the section on Spanish American Literature are too short, sometimes a mere list of contents. Valuable space in these very useful notes is sometimes wasted by words merely expressing the personal reactions of the bibliographer: the reader wants information on the book only. Two 'special articles' concern the bibliography of Spanish American journalism and that of Argentine sociology. The importance of the first topic for literature as well as for political history is of course far greater than a European would at first suppose, and this 'primera exploración' is greatly to be welcomed. The second list (surprisingly short) is preceded by a most interesting essay by Professor Poviña: the bibliography itself is a select one of sources. The preface to the bibliography of philosophy is an interesting list of journals published in Latin America in which articles on this branch of learning are to be found. Professor Frondizi laments the fact that no outstanding exclusively philosophical journal exists; Mexico and the Argentine appear to encourage philosophical writing most, and Colombia and Cuba seem to occupy the second place. To attempt to explain the relative absence of metaphysical activity in Latin America is a fascinating theme that would lead one very far into understanding the Latin American world. The editor of the Handbook and the long list of contributors have again earned the gratitude of all hispanists and others to whom this bibliography offers invaluable service.

SHEFFIELD

E. SARMIENTO

Professor Mario A. Pei's *Languages for War and Peace* (New York: Vanni, 1943. 575 pp.) contains useful summary accounts of English (English *v.* American), German, French, Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, Russian and Japanese, as well as briefer indications about other languages. The chapters have been done by experts, and each major language is accompanied by a classified vocabulary. The whole is directed toward practical ends and the editor's view is that

The man who has some practical acquaintance with English, French, German, Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, Russian, and Japanese is, roughly speaking, in a position to make his way round the world. If to this knowledge he adds a smattering of Arabic, Chinese, Malay, Dutch, and the ability to identify a few other tongues, so that he can distinguish between Polish and Czech, Swedish and Danish, Finnish and Hungarian at least in their written form, his linguistic education, for purely utilitarian purposes, is completed.

The persons concerned to acquire this multifarious knowledge will be 'American soldiers scattered through the four corners of the globe in the post-war days while the preliminaries of a permanent peace are being worked out', commercial missionaries and diplomatic and consular representatives.

One approaches so much erudition with due abasement. It seems we might have had to learn 2796 tongues, and indeed we may still be under that obligation for other than purely utilitarian purposes. The selection of necessary languages made is unexpected in some particulars. Chinese is rated curiously low in view of the assumption that China will be the fourth Great Power, an assumption said to be stronger in the United States than here. A glance at the map for Japanese explains the matter, since all the Japanese conquests are ringed round for Japanese. In like manner Italian is depicted as a language of emigration, colonization or wide use in South France, Dalmatia and Greece, Tunisia, Libya, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia and Somaliland. To represent languages by maps is extraordinarily difficult. Whatever the conventions adopted, the masses or colours make suggestions which may be quite misleading. Thus, for German, all Scandinavia is heavily barred as a place where German is 'widely spoken', and South America is pretty heavily dotted. Only a few dots represent English as 'widely-spoken' in Scandinavia, though even in Sweden—the most refractory of these states—there is more English than German, despite a strong academic prejudice against it. And how is one to represent the use of English in the China Seas, one of its principal areas of usefulness? Though the maps are on Mercator's projection, we lose the handsome bonus of North Canada and Baffinland, though the French language looks very solid in the Sahara and Congo forests.

So far as the choice of principal languages is concerned, I should rate Chinese above Japanese for utility and for scholarship. To read Japanese one has to learn two Chinese dialects! The need for Arabic in the Near East I should rate very high. In Iraq we came to the verge of disaster by plunging on with a mere *lingua franca* in a region where subtleties of intrigue are cardinal. In South and Central America one must have Spanish and Portuguese, but other languages are only valid for minority groups. In Europe only French ranks near English, since it is the key to the Mediterranean area and to cultured contacts. What use can be made of Russian, if Russia keeps her frontiers sealed, is, most uncertain.

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE

OXFORD

Don Joaquín Casaldüero's essay *Vida y obra de Galdós* (Buenos Aires. Editorial Losada. 1943. 186 pp. \$2 m/arg.) gives only the main lines of Pérez Galdós's biography and concentrates upon viewing the vast body of his work as a whole: 'se propone mostrar la unidad interior de la obra galdosiana y el desarrollo orgánico del mundo de Galdós, que va de la Historia a la Mitología, de la Materia al Espíritu, de España a la Humanidad.' The author of the *Episodios nacionales* wrote almost continuously for over fifty years, within which period the latest critic of his work discerns four epochs: (i) Histórico y abstracto; (ii) Naturalista; (iii) Espiritualista; (iv) Mitológico. About this division there are suggestions of arbitrariness, only partly overcome by the insertion of 'sub-periods', and one looks somewhat askance at the 'rhythm' of '13, 11, 13, 11', which, after some slight manipulation of his material, Sr. Casaldüero is able to find in Galdós's productivity. But this artificiality does not prevent his study from being a good one. We could, indeed, wish it were much longer, for the smallness of the scale and the size of the wood make it hard to see the individual trees, and each of these merits careful study. Sr. Casaldüero has not only a concise and closely-packed style but he can seize and convey the essential qualities of any work with which he deals, and thus he throws new light upon more than one of Galdós's best known novels. In the four pages, for example, which are all he can spare for *Doña Perfecta*, he brings out both the

españolismo and the universality of Galdós's conception of its principal figure, draws thumbnail sketches of the characters that surround her, fills in the background, estimates the position of the novel in the evolution of its author's art and discusses its somewhat obtrusive thesis. However much, or however little, the student may know of Galdós, he cannot fail to profit by reading this slight study.

E. ALLISON PEERS

LIVERPOOL

Few men of letters have ever caused themselves to be talked about more than Winckelmann. His vanity, snobbery and abnormality were as important as his scholarship from the point of view of publicity. One is reminded not a little of the fortunes of Oscar Wilde. Professor Henry Caraway Hatfield's *Winckelmann and his German Critics, 1755-81. A Prelude to the Classical Age* (Columbia University Germanic Studies, New Series, xv. New York: King's Crown Press. 1943. xi+169 pp. \$1.75) studies Winckelmann's vogue during his heyday and in the decade or so after his death. While the book covers well-tilled ground, it is obviously based upon a close study of contemporary sources and contributes valuable data. Much light is shed upon the background of the age of Lessing, but what we miss is a more generally penetrating summing-up of the Winckelmann tradition than is given in the rather perfunctory conclusion, particularly its effects upon the rise of the historical method in criticism, upon the movement towards the transference of aesthetic norms into the field of ethics and upon the mingling of Hellenism, primitivism and utopianism. The author surveys the reaction of contemporary periodical literature, and moves from Lessing to Klotz, Klopstock, Gerstenberg and Herder, and thence to the hostility of the *Sturm und Drang* and the general decline of the vogue in the 1770's. This last is of much significance, and the point emerges clearly that though Winckelmann's star soon set, his critics were Hellenists *malgré eux*, so great was the influence he exercised.

A. GILLIES

HULL

Blackwell's German Texts under the General Editorship of Professor Boyd is a series that has used very well the opportunity to widen the selection of annotated texts available for students of German literature. Books were needed to reflect a changed taste, to illustrate modern authors, and also to fill in some extraordinary gaps. A number of great writers have only been represented in the past by slighter or less characteristic work. Hebbel's *Herodes und Mariamne* (edited by Edna Purdie. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1943. xxxviii+168 pp. 7s. 6d.) is from this point of view a happy choice. It is a major work, an exciting one, and it shows more effectively than any other single play all the facets of Hebbel's creative ambition. An adverse view of Hebbel could maintain that his philosophy of history spoils his tragedy; or that his interest in a clash between two powerful 'characters' creating their own destiny spoils his philosophy of history; or that his psychology introduces distracting complications because it is now and again morbid. But *Herodes und Mariamne* certainly comes nearest to reconciling these hostile elements with a high degree of artistic unity, and perhaps it is because the play faces in several directions at once that it makes an effect of spaciousness and grandeur.

Professor Purdie's introduction and notes are full of discretion. They give the relevant highly interesting information about the sources and growth of the work, and it is difficult to imagine Hebbel better served by editorial purpose and enthusiasm. The editor has achieved particular success in one very notable way: without yielding a jot to an older style of editing in the matter of conscientiousness and detail, she has avoided irrelevance. Every line is informed with the one purpose of making the student sensitive to the author's creation in its various aspects.

R. PEACOCK

LEEDS

NEW PUBLICATIONS

April—June 1944

With the collaboration of PAMELA GRADON (English)

GENERAL

MARDHEKAR, B. S., *Two Lectures on an Aesthetic of Literature*. Bombay, Karnatak Publishing House. Rs. 1 As. 4.

The Yale Review Anthology, ed. by W. Cross and H. MacAfee. Yale and Oxford Univ. Presses. 18s. 6d.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES

Spanish.

MACKAY, D. E., *The Double Invitation in the Legend of Don Juan*. Stanford and Oxford Univ. Presses. 18s. 6d.

PEERS, E. A., *Spanish—Now*. London, Methuen. 6s.

French.

CLARK, R. E., and POSTON, L., Jr., *French Syntax List*. New York, Henry Holt.

HOFFMANN, E. J., *Alain Chartier*. New York, Wittes Press.

HUGO, V., *Les Feuilles d'Automne*, ed. by L. Bisson. Oxford, Blackwell. 6s.

LEWIS, D. B. W., *Ronsard*. London, Sheed and Ward. 12s. 6d.

PIERRE D'ABERNUN OF FETCHAM, *Le Secr  de Secrez*, ed. O. A. Beckerlegge (Anglo-Norman Texts, v). Oxford, Blackwell. 30s.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES

English.

(a) *General (including linguistic)*

CRAIGIE, W. A., *Problems of Spelling Reform* (S.P.E. Tract, LXIII). Oxford, Clarendon Press. 3s. 6d.

English Institute Annual, 1942. Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 16s. 6d.

ROUTH, H. V., *Basic English and the Problem of a World Language*. Royal Society of Literature. Distributed by S. Marshall. 1s.

Year's Work in English Studies, The, XXII, 1941, ed. by F. S. Boas. London, H. Milford, for the English Association. 10s. 6d.

(b) *Old and Middle English*

REED, T. D., *The Battle for Britain in the Fifth Century*. London, Methuen. 10s. 6d.

Sir Gawain and the Green Knight, trans. by M. R. Ridley. Leicester, Edmund Ward. 7s. 6d.

(c) *Modern English*

Athenians, The, being Correspondence between Thomas Jefferson Hogg and his Friends Thomas Love Peacock, Leigh Hunt, Percy Bysshe Shelley and others, ed. by W. S. Scott. Golden Cockerel Press. £3. 3s.

BALDWIN, T. W., *William Shakspeare's Small Latine and Lesse Greeke*. 2 vols. Urbana, Univ. of Illinois Press. \$15.75.

BETHELL, S. L., *Shakespeare and the Popular Dramatic Tradition*. London, P. S. King and Staples. 10s. 6d.

CRAIG, H., *Shakespeare and the Normal World*. Houston, Texas, The Rice Institute.

- GARDNER, W. H., Gerard Manley Hopkins; A Study of Poetic Idiosyncrasy in Relation to Poetic Tradition. London, Secker and Warburg. 25s.
- GASCOIGNE, G., A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres, ed. by C. T. Prouty. Univ. of Missouri Studies, No. 2. Columbia, Univ. of Missouri. \$2.50.
- GORDON, G., Shakespearian Comedy and other Studies. London, Oxford Univ. Press. 7s. 6d.
- KERNAHAN, C., Nothing Quite Like Kipling Has Happened Before. London, Epworth Press. 3s. 6d.
- KNIGHT, G. W., The Olive and the Sword. London, Oxford Univ. Press. 6s.
- MILTON, J., Complete Poetical Works, Reproduced in Photographic Facsimile, ed. by H. F. Fletcher. Vol. I. Urbana, Univ. of Illinois Press. \$20.
- O'SULLIVAN, S., Essays and Recollections. Dublin, The Talbot Press. 5s.
- PRESTON, K., Blake and Rossetti. London, Alexander Moring. 18s.
- ROSS, M. M., Milton's Royalism. A Study of the Conflict of Symbol and Idea in the Poems. Cornell and Oxford Univ. Presses. 15s. 6d.
- SMITH, J. C., A Study of Wordsworth. Edinburgh, Oliver and Boyd. 5s.
- TREECE, H., (ed.) Herbert Read. An Introduction to his Work by Various Hands. London, Faber. 10s. 6d.
- WARD, M., G. K. Chesterton. London, Sheed and Ward. 21s.
- YEATS, J. B., Letters to his Son W. B. Yeats and others, 1869-1922, ed. with a Memoir by J. Hone. London, Faber. 16s.